arXiv:1608.05382v1 [math.NT] 18 Aug 2016

A BIRATIONAL NEVANLINNA CONSTANT AND ITS CONSEQUENCES

MIN RU AND PAUL VOJTA

Abstract. The purpose of this paper is to modify the notion of the Nevanlinna constant $\mathrm{Nev}(D)$, recently introduced by the first author, for an effective Cartier divisor on a projective variety X. The modified notion is called the *birational Nevanlinna constant* and is denoted by $\mathrm{Nev}_{\mathrm{bir}}(D)$. By computing $\mathrm{Nev}_{\mathrm{bir}}(D)$ using the filtration constructed by Autissier in 2011, we establish a general result (see the General Theorem in the Introduction), in both the arithmetic and complex cases, which extends to general divisors the 2008 results of Evertse and Ferretti and the 2009 results of the first author. The notion $\mathrm{Nev}_{\mathrm{bir}}(D)$ is originally defined in terms of Weil functions for use in applications, and it is proved later in this paper that it can be defined in terms of local effectivity of Cartier divisors after taking a proper birational lifting. In the last two sections, we use the notion $\mathrm{Nev}_{\mathrm{bir}}(D)$ to recover the proof of an example of Faltings from his 2002 *Baker's Garden* article.

1. Introduction

We consider the following questions: *For a given effective Cartier divisor D on a given projective variety X, find the conditions (for D and X) such that every holomorphic mapping $f\colon \mathbb{C} \to X\backslash D$ must be degenerate (i.e. its image is contained some proper subvariety of X); If both D and X are defined over a number field k, then one also asks when every set of integral points of $X\backslash D$ must be degenerate.* In answering the above questions, the first author introduced ([Ru15a] and [Ru15b]) the notion of the *Nevanlinna constant*, denoted by $\mathrm{Nev}(D)$, and proved that *if* $\mathrm{Nev}(D) < 1$*, then every holomorphic mapping $f\colon \mathbb{C} \to X\backslash D$ must be degenerate, and every set of integral points of $X\backslash D$ must also be degenerate if both D and X are defined over a number field k.* Moreover, the quantitative versions of the above results, in the spirit of Nevanlinna–Roth–Cartan–Schmidt, are also obtained.

We recall his result in detail here. For notations see Sections 2 and 3.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 14G25, 32H30, 14C20, 11J97, 11G35.

Key words and phrases. Nevanlinna constant; Schmidt's subspace theorem; integral points.

Definition 1.1 (see [Ru15a] and [Ru15b]). *Let X be a normal projective variety, and let D be an effective Cartier divisor on X. The* ***Nevanlinna constant*** *of D, denoted* $\mathrm{Nev}(D)$*, is given by*

$$\mathrm{Nev}(D) = \inf_{N,V,\mu} \frac{\dim V}{\mu}\,, \tag{1}$$

where the infimum is taken over all triples (N, V, μ) such that N is a positive integer, V is a linear subspace of $H^0(X, \mathscr{L}^N)$ with $\dim V \geq 2$, and μ is a positive real number such that, for all $P \in \operatorname{Supp} D$, there exists a basis $\mathcal{B}$ of V with

$$\sum_{s\in\mathcal{B}} \mathrm{ord}_E(s) \geq \mu\, \mathrm{ord}_E(ND) \tag{2}$$

for all irreducible components E of D passing through P. If $\dim H^0(X, \mathscr{O}(ND)) \leq 1$ for all positive integers N, we define $\mathrm{Nev}(D) = +\infty$. For a general complete variety X, $\mathrm{Nev}(D)$ is defined by pulling back to the normalization of X.

Theorem A (see [Ru15a]). *Let X be a complex projective variety, and let D be an effective Cartier divisor on X. Then, for every $\epsilon > 0$,*

$$m_f(r, D) \leq_{\mathrm{exc}} (\mathrm{Nev}(D) + \epsilon)\, T_{f,D}(r)$$

holds for any holomorphic mapping $f\colon \mathbb{C} \to X$ with Zariski-dense image. Here the notation $\leq_{\mathrm{exc}}$ means that the inequality holds for all $r \in (0, \infty)$ outside of a set of finite Lebesgue measure.

Theorem B (see [Ru15b]). *Let k be a number field, and let S be a finite set of places of k containing all of the archimedean places. Let X be a projective variety over k, and let D be an effective Cartier divisor on X. Then, for every $\epsilon > 0$, the inequality*

$$m_S(x, D) \leq (\mathrm{Nev}(D) + \epsilon)\, h_D(x)$$

holds for all $x \in X(k)$ outside a proper Zariski closed subset of X.

As was shown in [Ru15a] and [Ru15b], by computing $\mathrm{Nev}(D)$, the above results recover the results of Evertse–Ferretti [EF08] and of [Ru09], as well as derive new results for divisors which are not necessarily linear equivalent on X. More importantly, it led to a unified proof (for the known results) by simply computing $\mathrm{Nev}(D)$.

In attempting to use the filtration constructed by Autissier in [Aut11] to derive a more general result (see the General Theorem below), as well as in deriving a proof of an example of Faltings [Fal02] from the view of $\mathrm{Nev}(D)$, the authors realized that the notion of $\mathrm{Nev}(D)$ is not general enough to serve our purpose. More specifically, as we shall see, the (pointwise) maximum of

two or more Weil functions occurs in the proofs, and this is not in general a Weil function. All of these facts motivate the following modified definition.

Let $\mathscr{L}$ be a line sheaf on X and let $\mathcal{B}$ be a finite set of global sections of $\mathscr{L}$. Then we let $(\mathcal{B})$ denote the sum of the divisors (s) for all $s \in \mathcal{B}$:

$$(\mathcal{B}) = \sum_{s \in \mathcal{B}} (s) \, . \tag{3}$$

Definition 1.2. *Let X be a normal complete variety, let D be an effective Cartier divisor on X, and let $\mathscr{L}$ be a line sheaf on X. Then*

$$\mathrm{Nev}_{\mathrm{bir}}(\mathscr{L}, D) = \inf_{N,V,\mu} \frac{\dim V}{\mu} \, ,$$

where the infimum passes over all triples (N, V, μ) such that $N \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, V is a linear subspace of $H^0(X, \mathscr{L}^N)$ with $\dim V > 1$, and $\mu \in \mathbb{Q}_{>0}$, with the following property. There are finitely many bases $\mathcal{B}_1, \dots, \mathcal{B}_\ell$ of V; Weil functions $\lambda_{\mathcal{B}_1}, \dots, \lambda_{\mathcal{B}_\ell}$ for the divisors $(\mathcal{B}_1), \dots, (\mathcal{B}_\ell)$, respectively; a Weil function λ_D for D; and an M_k-constant c such that

$$\max_{1 \le i \le \ell} \lambda_{\mathcal{B}_i} \ge \mu N \lambda_D - c \tag{4}$$

(as functions $X(M_k) \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$). (Here we use the same convention as in Definition 1.1 when there are no triples (N, V, μ) that satisfy the condition.)

If L is a Cartier divisor or Cartier divisor class on X, then we define $\mathrm{Nev}_{\mathrm{bir}}(L, D) = \mathrm{Nev}_{\mathrm{bir}}(\mathscr{O}(L), D)$. *We also define* $\mathrm{Nev}_{\mathrm{bir}}(D) = \mathrm{Nev}_{\mathrm{bir}}(D, D)$.

Remark 1.3. Since $\mathrm{Nev}_{\mathrm{bir}}(\mathscr{L}, D)$ is a birational invariant (Proposition 5.6(a)), and since blowing up turns a proper closed subscheme into an effective Cartier divisor, the restriction that D be an effective Cartier divisor is unnecessary. Indeed, we can use the definitions of Silverman [Sil87] or Yamanoi [Yam04, Def. 2.2.1] to define Weil functions for proper closed subschemes; one may then allow D to be a proper closed subscheme (or a finite linear combination of proper closed subschemes with coefficients in $\mathbb{N}$, or even in $\mathbb{R}^+$).

With the notation $\mathrm{Nev}_{\mathrm{bir}}(\mathscr{L}, D)$, we modify Theorems A and B as follows:

Theorem 1.4. *Let X be a complex projective variety, let D be an effective Cartier divisor and $\mathscr{L}$ be a line sheaf on X with $\dim H^0(X, \mathscr{L}^N) \ge 1$ for some $N > 0$. Let $f \colon \mathbb{C} \to X$ be a holomorphic mapping with Zariski-dense image. Then, for every $\epsilon > 0$,*

$$m_f(r, D) \le_{\mathrm{exc}} (\mathrm{Nev}_{\mathrm{bir}}(\mathscr{L}, D) + \epsilon) \, T_{f, \mathscr{L}}(r). \tag{5}$$

Theorem 1.5. *Let k be a number field, and let S be a finite set of places of k containing all archimedean places. Let X be a projective variety over k, and let D be an effective Cartier divisor on X. Let $\mathscr{L}$ be a line sheaf on X*

with $\dim H^0(X, \mathscr{L}^N) \geq 1$ *for some* $N > 0$*. Then, for every* $\epsilon > 0$*, there is a proper Zariski-closed subset* Z *of* X *such that the inequality*

$$m_S(x, D) \leq (\mathrm{Nev}_{\mathrm{bir}}(\mathscr{L}, D) + \epsilon)\, h_{\mathscr{L}}(x) \tag{6}$$

holds for all $x \in X(k)$ *outside of* Z*.*

Corollary 1.6. *Let* X *be a projective variety over a number field* k*, and let* D *be an ample Cartier divisor on* X*. If* $\mathrm{Nev}_{\mathrm{bir}}(D) < 1$ *then there is a proper Zariski-closed subset* Z *of* X *such that any set of* D*-integral points on* X *has only finitely many points outside of* Z*.*

We note that while the above definition of $\mathrm{Nev}_{\mathrm{bir}}(\mathscr{L}, D)$ is convenient for use in applications, it involves Weil functions in its definition. As we shall see later, one can actually get rid of the Weil functions in the definition of $\mathrm{Nev}_{\mathrm{bir}}(\mathscr{L}, D)$ by taking a proper birational lifting. So we propose the second (equivalent) definition $\mathrm{Nev}_{\mathrm{bir}}(\mathscr{L}, D)$.

Definition 1.7. *Let* X *be a complete variety, let* D *be an effective Cartier divisor on* X*, and let* $\mathscr{L}$ *be a line sheaf on* X*. If* X *is normal, then we define*

$$\mathrm{Nev}_{\mathrm{bir}}(\mathscr{L}, D) = \inf_{N,V,\mu} \frac{\dim V}{\mu}\,,$$

where the infimum passes over all triples (N, V, μ) *such that* $N \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$*,* V *is a linear subspace of* $H^0(X, \mathscr{L}^N)$ *with* $\dim V > 1$*, and* $\mu \in \mathbb{Q}_{>0}$*, with the following property. There are a variety* Y *and a proper birational morphism* $\phi\colon Y \to X$ *such that the following condition holds. For all* $Q \in Y$ *there is a basis* $\mathcal{B}$ *of* V *such that*

$$\phi^*(\mathcal{B}) \geq \mu N \phi^* D \tag{7}$$

in a Zariski-open neighborhood U *of* Q*, relative to the cone of effective* $\mathbb{Q}$*-divisors on* U*. If there are no such triples* (N, V, μ)*, then* $\mathrm{Nev}_{\mathrm{bir}}(\mathscr{L}, D)$ *is defined to be* $+\infty$*. For a general complete variety* X*,* $\mathrm{Nev}_{\mathrm{bir}}(\mathscr{L}, D)$ *is defined by pulling back to the normalization of* X*.*

Note that a *birational morphism* from X to Y is a morphism $X \to Y$ that has an inverse as a rational map; in other words, it is a birational map $X \dashrightarrow Y$ that is regular everywhere on X.

One of the goals of this paper is to prove that these two definitions (Definitions 1.2 and 1.7) are equivalent.

Another goal of this paper is to use Theorems 1.5 and 1.4, together with the filtration constructed by Autissier in [Aut11], to prove the following two General Theorems (in the arithmetic and analytic cases).

Throughout this section, we use $h^0(\mathscr{L})$ to denote $\dim H^0(X,\mathscr{L})$ for a line sheaf $\mathscr{L}$ on X, $h^0(D)$ to denote $\dim H^0(X,\mathscr{O}(D))$ for an effective divisor D on X, and $H^0(X,\mathscr{L}(-D))$ to denote $H^0(X,\mathscr{L}\otimes\mathscr{O}(-D))$.

Definition 1.8. *Let $\mathscr{L}$ be a line sheaf and D be a nonzero effective Cartier divisor on a complete variety X. We define*

$$\gamma(\mathscr{L},D)=\inf_N \frac{Nh^0(\mathscr{L}^N)}{\sum_{m\geq 1}h^0(\mathscr{L}^N(-mD))}, \tag{8}$$

where N passes over all positive integers such that $h^0(\mathscr{L}^N(-D))\neq 0$. (Note that $|\mathscr{L}^N|$ does not have to be base point free). If $h^0(\mathscr{L}^N(-D))=0$ for all N, then we set $\gamma(\mathscr{L},D)=+\infty$.

General Theorem (Arithmetic Part)**.** *Let X be a projective variety over a number field k, and let $D_1,\dots,D_q$ be effective Cartier divisors intersecting properly on X. Let $D=D_1+\cdots+D_q$. Let $\mathscr{L}$ be a line sheaf on X with $h^0(\mathscr{L}^N)\geq 1$ for N big enough. Let $S\subset M_k$ be a finite set of places. Then, for every $\epsilon>0$,*

$$m_S(x,D)\leq\left(\max_{1\leq j\leq q}\gamma(\mathscr{L},D_j)+\epsilon\right)h_{\mathscr{L}}(x),$$

holds for all k-rational points outside a proper Zariski closed subset of X.

General Theorem (Analytic Part)**.** *Let X be a complex projective variety and let $D_1,\dots,D_q$ be effective Cartier divisors intersecting properly on X. Let $D=D_1+\cdots+D_q$. Let $\mathscr{L}$ be a line sheaf on X with $h^0(\mathscr{L}^N)\geq 1$ for N big enough. Let $f:\mathbb{C}\to X$ be an algebraically non-degenerate holomorphic map. Then, for every $\epsilon>0$,*

$$m_f(r,D)\leq_{\mathrm{exc}}\left(\max_{1\leq j\leq q}\gamma(\mathscr{L},D_j)+\epsilon\right)T_{f,\mathscr{L}}(r).$$

Write $\gamma(D_j):=\gamma(\mathscr{O}(D),D_j)$ with $D:=D_1+\cdots+D_q$. To compute $\gamma(D_j)$, we consider $D_1,\dots,D_q$ which are effective Cartier divisors on X in general position, such that each D_j is linearly equivalent to a fixed ample divisor A. By the Riemann-Roch theorem, with $n=\dim X$,

$$h^0(ND)=h^0(qNA)=\frac{(qN)^nA^n}{n!}+o(N^n)$$

and

$$h^0(ND-mD_j)=h^0((qN-m)A)=\frac{(qN-m)^nA^n}{n!}+o(N^n).$$

Thus

$$\sum_{m\geq 1}h^0(ND-mD_j)=\frac{A^n}{n!}\sum_{l=0}^{qN-1}l^n+o(N^{n+1})=\frac{A^n(qN-1)^{n+1}}{(n+1)!}+o(N^{n+1}).$$

Hence

$$\gamma(D_j) = \lim_{N\to\infty} \frac{N\frac{(qN)^n A^n}{n!} + o(N^{n+1})}{\frac{A^n(qN-1)^{n+1}}{(n+1)!} + o(N^{n+1})} = \frac{n+1}{q}.$$

Therefore, the General Theorems imply the following results of Evertse–Ferretti in the case when X is Cohen–Macaulay (for example X is smooth) as well as the result of Ru.

Theorem C (Evertse–Ferretti [EF08])**.** *Let X be a projective variety over a number field k, and let $D_1, \dots, D_q$ be effective divisors on X in general position. Let $S \subset M_k$ be a finite set of places. Assume that there exist an ample divisor A on X and positive integers d_i such that D_i is linearly equivalent to $d_i A$ for $i = 1, \dots, q$. Then, for every $\epsilon > 0$,*

$$\sum_{i=1}^{q} \frac{1}{d_i} m_S(x, D_i) \le (\dim X + 1 + \epsilon) h_A(x)$$

holds for all k-rational points outside a proper Zariski closed subset of X.

Theorem D ([Ru09])**.** *Let X be a smooth complex projective variety and $D_1, \dots, D_q$ be effective divisors on X, located in general position. Suppose that there exists an ample divisor A on X and positive integers d_i such that D_i is linearly equivalent to $d_i A$ on X for $i = 1, \dots, q$. Let $f : \mathbb{C} \to X$ be an algebraically non-degenerate holomorphic map. Then, for every $\epsilon > 0$,*

$$\sum_{i=1}^{q} \frac{1}{d_i} m_f(r, D_i) \le_{\text{exc}} (\dim X + 1 + \epsilon) T_{f,A}(r).$$

More computations of $\gamma(D_i)$ and consequences of the General Theorems will be given later.

It is important to note that our General Theorem can be proved without using the notion of $\text{Nev}_{\text{bir}}(\mathscr{L}, D)$ (and thus not using Theorem 1.5 and Theorem 1.4) by, instead, applying the Schmidt's subspace theorem and H. Cartan's theorem directly (see the proof below). More importantly our proof greatly simplifies the original proof of Evertse–Ferretti and of Ru, where the Chow and Hilbert weights are involved.

Our paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we introduce notations and preliminaries. In Section 3, we review the definition and properties of Weil functions. In Section 4, we give a proof of our General Theorem as well as discuss its application in the case when $D = D_1 + \cdots + D_q$ has equidegree. Sections 5 and 6 are devoted to proving that the two definitions of $\text{Nev}_{\text{bir}}(D)$ given in this section are equivalent. Section 7 gives a proof of the main theorems involving $\text{Nev}_{\text{bir}}(D)$. Finally, in Sections 8 and 9, we revisit the example of Faltings [Fal02], since its proof gave the original motivation for our modified Nevanlinna constant.

We will primarily discuss the number field cases of our results here. The corresponding results in Nevanlinna theory can be proved by similar methods, as can the diophantine results over function fields of characteristic zero.

2. Notation and Preliminaries

In this paper, $\mathbb{N} = \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$ and $\mathbb{R}^+$ is the interval $[0, \infty)$.

2.1. **Notation and conventions in number theory.** For a number field k, recall that M_k denotes the set of places of k, and that k_v denotes the completion of k at a place $v \in M_k$. Norms $\|\cdot\|_v$ on k are normalized so that

$$\|x\|_v = |\sigma(x)|^{[k_v:\mathbb{R}]} \qquad \text{or} \qquad \|p\|_v = p^{-[k_v:\mathbb{Q}_p]}$$

if $v \in M_k$ is an archimedean place corresponding to an embedding $\sigma\colon k \hookrightarrow \mathbb{C}$ or a non-archimedean place lying over a rational prime p, respectively.

Heights are logarithmic and relative to the number field used as a base field, which is always denoted by k. For example, if P is a point on $\mathbb{P}^n_k$ with homogeneous coordiantes $[x_0 : \cdots : x_n]$ in k, then

$$h(P) = h_{\mathscr{O}(1)}(P) = \sum_{v \in M_k} \log \max\{\|x_0\|_v, \dots, \|x_n\|_v\} \, .$$

We use the standard notations of Nevanlinna theory and Diophantine approximation (see, for example, [Voj11], [Ru15a] and [Ru15b]).

2.2. **Notation in algebraic geometry.** A *variety* over a field k is an integral scheme, separated and of finite type over $\operatorname{Spec} k$. A morphism of varieties is a morphism of schemes over k. A *line sheaf* is a locally free sheaf of rank 1 (an invertible sheaf).

If $\mathscr{L}$ is a line sheaf on a variety X, then $\mathscr{L}^n$ denotes the n^{th} tensor power $\mathscr{L}^{\otimes n}$, and if D is a Cartier divisor on X, then $\mathscr{L}(D)$ denotes $\mathscr{L} \otimes \mathscr{O}(D)$.

Definition 2.1. *Let $D_1, \dots, D_q$ be effective Cartier divisors on a variety X of dimension n.*

(a). *We say that $D_1, \dots, D_q$ lie in **general position** if for any $I \subseteq \{1, \dots, q\}$, we have $\dim(\bigcap_{i\in I} \operatorname{Supp} D_i) = n - \#I$ if $\#I \le n$, and $\bigcap_{i\in I} \operatorname{Supp} D_i = \emptyset$ if $\#I > n$.*

(b). *We say that $D_1, \dots, D_q$ **intersect properly** if for any subset $I \subseteq \{1, \dots, q\}$ and any $x \in \bigcap_{i\in I} \operatorname{Supp} D_i$, the sequence $(\phi_i)_{i\in I}$ is a regular sequence in the local ring $\mathscr{O}_{X,x}$, where ϕ_i are the local defining functions of D_i, $1 \le i \le q$.*

Remark 2.2. By Matsumura [Mat86, Thm. 17.4], if $D_1, \dots, D_q$ intersect properly, then they lie in general position. The converse holds if X is Cohen–Macaulay (this is true if X is nonsingular).

2.3. **Theorems of Schmidt and Cartan.** Schmidt's Subspace Theorem and the corresponding theorem of Cartan play a central role in this paper. This subsection recalls the specific variants of these theorems to be used in this paper.

We start with some notation, starting with the number field case. Let k be a number field, and let H be a hyperplane in $\mathbb{P}^n_k$. Let $a_0x_0+\cdots+a_nx_n$ be a linear form with $a_0, \dots, a_n \in k$ whose vanishing determines the hyperplane H. Then, for all $v \in M_k$ and all rational points $P \in \mathbb{P}^n_k(k)$ with homogeneous coordinates $[x_0 : \cdots : x_n]$, we let

$$\lambda_{H,v}(P) = -\log \frac{\|a_0x_0 + \cdots + a_nx_n\|_v}{\max\{\|a_0\|_v, \dots, \|a_n\|_v\} \cdot \max\{\|x_0\|_v, \dots, \|x_n\|_v\}} .$$

This quantity is independent of the choice of homogeneous coordinates for P, and also does not depend on the linear form $a_0x_0 + \cdots + a_nx_n$ chosen above.

Then Schmidt's Subspace theorem is as follows (see [Ru15b, Thm. 2.8], for example).

Theorem 2.3. *Let k be a number field, let S be a finite set of places of k containing all archimedean places, let n be a positive integer, let $H_1, \dots, H_q$ be hyperplanes in $\mathbb{P}^n_k$, let $\epsilon > 0$, and let $c \in \mathbb{R}$. Then there is a finite union Z of proper linear subspace of $\mathbb{P}^n_k$, depending only on k, S, n, $H_1, \dots, H_q$, ϵ, and c, such that the inequality*

$$\sum_{v\in S} \max_J \sum_{j\in J} \lambda_{H_j,v}(x) \le (n+1+\epsilon)h(x) + c$$

holds for all $x \in (\mathbb{P}^n_k \setminus Z)(k)$. Here the set J ranges over all subsets of $\{1, \dots, q\}$ such that the hyperplanes $(H_j)_{j\in J}$ lie in general position.

The corresponding theorem for approximation to hyperplanes by holomorphic curves is due to Cartan [Car33].

Again, we first need a definition. Let H be a hyperplane in $\mathbb{P}^n_{\mathbb{C}}$, and let $a_0x_0+\cdots+a_nx_n$ be a linear form whose vanishing determines H. Then, for all $P \in \mathbb{P}^n_{\mathbb{C}}$, choose homogeneous coordinates $[x_0 : \cdots : x_n]$ for P, and let

$$\lambda_H(P) = -\frac{1}{2}\log \frac{|a_0x_0 + \cdots + a_nx_n|^2}{(|a_0|^2 + \cdots + |a_n|^2)(|x_0|^2 + \cdots + |x_n|^2)} .$$

Again, this does not depend on the choice of the form $a_0x_0 + \cdots + a_nx_n$ or on the choice of homogeneous coordinates $[x_0 : \cdots : x_n]$.

Then the theorem of Cartan to be used here is as follows (see [Ru15a], for example).

Theorem 2.4. *Let n be a positive integer, let $H_1, \dots, H_q$ be hyperplanes in $\mathbb{P}^n_{\mathbb{C}}$, and let $f\colon \mathbb{C} \to \mathbb{P}^n_{\mathbb{C}}$ be a holomorphic curve whose image is not contained in a hyperplane. Then, for any $\epsilon > 0$,*

$$\int_0^{2\pi} \max_J \sum_{j \in J} \lambda_{H_j}(f(re^{i\theta}))\, \frac{d\theta}{2\pi} \leq_{\mathrm{exc}} (n+1+\epsilon) T_f(r),$$

where J varies over the same collection of sets as in Theorem 2.3, and where the notation $\leq_{\mathrm{exc}}$ means that the inequality holds for all $r \in (0,\infty)$ outside of a set of finite Lebesgue measure.

Remark 2.5. In the above two theorems, there is a finite union Z_1 of proper linear subspaces of $\mathbb{P}^n_k$ or $\mathbb{P}^n_{\mathbb{C}}$ (in Theorems 2.3 and 2.4, respectively), depending only on the hyperplanes $H_1, \dots, H_q$, with the following properties. In Theorem 2.3, the subset Z may be taken to be the union of Z_1 and a finite union of points, and in Theorem 2.4, the condition on the holomorphic curve f may be relaxed to allow any nonconstant holomorphic map $f\colon \mathbb{C} \to \mathbb{P}^n_{\mathbb{C}}$ whose image is not contained in Z_1. See [Voj89] and [Voj97], respectively.

Remark 2.6. Since the functions $\lambda_{H,v}$ are bounded from below, we may assume in Theorems 2.3 and 2.4 that $\bigcap H_i = \emptyset$ (include more hyperplanes). Then, in each of these theorems, we may also require that all of the sets J have $n+1$ elements.

When working with the methods of Corvaja, Zannier, Evertse, Ferretti, Autissier, and the first author, it is useful to phrase Theorems 2.3 and 2.4 in terms of divisors in a linear system. This leads to Theorems 2.7 and 2.8, below. (In this paper, they are used to prove the General Theorems of Section 4, and to prove Proposition 7.1.)

Theorems 2.7 and 2.8 use the notion of Weil functions (the functions λ_H above are examples of Weil functions). The reader not already familiar with these functions is encouraged to refer to Section 3 or to the references contained therein for more information.

Theorem 2.7. *Let k be a number field, let S be a finite set of places of k containing all archimedean places, let X be a complete variety over k, let D be a Cartier divisor on X, let V be a nonzero linear subspace of $H^0(X, \mathscr{O}(D))$, let $s_1, \dots, s_q$ be nonzero elements of V, let $\epsilon > 0$, and let $c \in \mathbb{R}$. For each $i = 1, \dots, q$, let D_j be the Cartier divisor (s_j), and let λ_{D_j} be a Weil function for D_j. Then there is a proper Zariski-closed subset Z of X, depending only on k, S, X, L, V, $s_1, \dots, s_q$, ϵ, c, and the choices of*

Weil and height functions, such that the inequality

$$\sum_{v\in S}\max_{J}\sum_{j\in J}\lambda_{D_j,v}(x)\le(\dim V+\epsilon)h_D(x)+c \tag{9}$$

holds for all $x\in(X\setminus Z)(k)$. Here the set J ranges over all subsets of $\{1,\dots,q\}$ such that the sections $(s_j)_{j\in J}$ are linearly independent.

Proof. Let $d=\dim V$. We may assume that $d>1$ (otherwise, all D_j are the same divisor, and the sets J have at most one element each, so (9) follows immediately from (the number theory version of) the First Main Theorem).

Let $\Phi\colon X\dashrightarrow\mathbb{P}^{d-1}_k$ be the rational map associated to the linear system V. Let X' be the closure of the graph of Φ, and let $p\colon X'\to X$ and $\phi\colon X'\to\mathbb{P}^{d-1}_k$ be the projection morphisms.

Note that, even though Φ extends to the morphism $\phi\colon X'\to\mathbb{P}^{d-1}_k$, the linear system of $H^0(X',p^*\mathscr{O}(D))$ corresponding to V may still have base points. What is true, however, is that there is an effective Cartier divisor B on X' such that, for each nonzero $s\in V$, there is a hyperplane H in $\mathbb{P}^{d-1}_k$ such that $p^*(s)-B=\phi^*H$. (More precisely, $\phi^*\mathscr{O}(1)\cong\mathscr{O}(p^*D-B)$. The map

$$\alpha\colon H^0(X',\mathscr{O}(p^*D-B))\to H^0(X,\mathscr{O}(p^*D))$$

defined by tensoring with the canonical global section 1_B of $\mathscr{O}(B)$ is injective, and its image contains $p^*(V)$. The preimage $\alpha^{-1}(p^*(V))$ corresponds to a base-point-free linear system for the divisor p^*D-B.)

For each $j=1,\dots,q$ let H_j be the hyperplane in $\mathbb{P}^{d-1}_k$ for which $p^*(s_j)-B=\phi^*H_j$. Choose a Weil function λ_B for B. Then, for all $v\in S$ and all $j=1,\dots,q$, we have

$$p^*\lambda_{D_j,v}=\phi^*\lambda_{H_j,v}+\lambda_{B,v}+O(1)\ .$$

Therefore it will suffice to prove that for any $c'\in\mathbb{R}$ the inequality

$$\sum_{v\in S}\max_{J}\sum_{j\in J}(\lambda_{H_j,v}(\phi(x))+\lambda_{B,v}(x))\le(\dim V+\epsilon)h_D(p(x))+c' \tag{10}$$

holds for all $x\in X'(k)$ outside of some proper Zariski-closed subset Z' of X'. Indeed, for suitable c' this will imply (9) outside of $Z:=p(Z'\cup\operatorname{Supp}B)$. The set Z is Zariski-closed in X because $p\colon X'\to X$ is a proper morphism, and $Z\ne X$ because p is birational.

For any subset J of $\{1,\dots,q\}$, the sections s_j, $j\in J$ are linearly independent elements of V if and only if the hyperplanes H_j, $j\in J$ lie in general

position in $\mathbb{P}^{d-1}_k$. Therefore we may apply Theorem 2.3, to obtain that for any c'' the inequality

$$\sum_{v\in S}\max_J\sum_{j\in J}\lambda_{H_j,v}(\phi(x))(x)\le(\dim V+\epsilon)h(\phi(x))+c'' \tag{11}$$

holds for all $x\in X'(k)$ for which $\phi(x)$ does not lie in a finite union Z'' of proper linear subspaces of $\mathbb{P}^{d-1}_k$. Here Z'' depends on k, S, d, $H_1,\dots,H_q$, ϵ, and c'', but not on x.

Since each set J as above has at most $\dim V$ elements and B is effective, we have

$$(\#J)\lambda_{B,v}(x)\le(\dim V)\lambda_{B,v}(x)+O(1)$$

for all $x\in X'(k)$. Therefore, (11) implies (10) for all $x\in X'(k)$ outside of $Z':=\phi^{-1}(Z'')$. Since the coordinates of ϕ are associated to linearly independent elements of $p^*(V)$, the (closed) set Z' is not all of X'. □

Theorem 2.8. *Let X be a complex projective variety, let D be a Cartier divisor on X, let V be a nonzero linear subspace of $H^0(X,\mathscr{O}(D))$, and let $s_1,\dots,s_q$ be nonzero elements of V. For each $i=1,\dots,q$, let D_j be the Cartier divisor (s_j), and let λ_{D_j} be a Weil function for D_j. Let $f\colon\mathbb{C}\to X$ be a holomorphic map with Zariski-dense image. Then, for any $\epsilon>0$,*

$$\int_0^{2\pi}\max_J\sum_{j\in J}\lambda_{D_j}(f(re^{i\theta}))\le_{\mathrm{exc}}(\dim V)T_{f,D}(r)+O(\log^+T_{f,D}(r))+o(\log r)\,.$$

Here the set J ranges over all subsets of $\{1,\dots,q\}$ such that the sections $(s_j)_{j\in J}$ are linearly independent.

The proof of this theorem is very similar to the proof of Theorem 2.7, and is omitted.

Remark 2.9. In Theorems 2.7 and 2.8, if the rational map $X\dashrightarrow\mathbb{P}^{d-1}$ is generically finite, then there is a proper Zariski-closed subset Z_1 of X, depending only on D, V, and $s_1,\dots,s_q$, with the following properties. In Theorem 2.7, the subset Z may be taken to be the union of Z_1 and a finite union of points, and in Theorem 2.8, the condition on the holomorphic curve f may be relaxed to allow any nonconstant holomorphic map $f\colon\mathbb{C}\to\mathbb{P}^n_{\mathbb{C}}$ whose image is not contained in Z_1. Indeed, in the notation of the proof of Theorem 2.7, we may take $Z_1=p(\phi^{-1}(Z_1')\cup Z_2\cup\operatorname{Supp}B)$, where $Z_1'\subseteq\mathbb{P}^{d-1}$ is the closed subset of Remark 2.5 and Z_2 is the subset of X' where ϕ is not finite.

Remark 2.10. In Theorems 2.7 and 2.8, we may assume (by shrinking V or using more sections) that $s_1,\dots,s_q$ span V. Under this assumption, we may instead take the maximum over all sets J such that $(s_j)_{j\in J}$ is a basis of V.

3. Weil Functions

Let X be a variety over $\mathbb{C}$, let D be an effective Cartier divisor on X, and let $s = 1_D$ be a canonical section of $\mathscr{O}(D)$ (i.e., a global section for which $(s) = D$). Choose a smooth metric $|\cdot|$ on $\mathscr{O}(D)$. In Nevanlinna theory, one often encounters the function

$$\lambda_D(x) := -\log|s(x)|\ ; \tag{12}$$

this is a real-valued function on $X(\mathbb{C}) \setminus \operatorname{Supp} D$. It is linear in D (over a suitable domain), so by linearity and continuity it can be extended to a definition of λ_D for a general Cartier divisor D on X.

Weil functions are counterparts to such functions in number theory. In number theory, however, the situation is more complicated because a number field has infinitely many inequivalent absolute values, and because $\overline{k}_v$ is not locally compact unless v is archimedean. One often needs to sum over all absolute values of k, so an inequality that is true up to $O(1)$ in Nevanlinna theory needs to be true up to a constant that vanishes for almost all (all but finitely many) v in number theory.

Giving a full definition of Weil functions is beyond the scope of this paper; see Lang [Lan83, Ch. 10] for a full treatment of Weil functions, or the second author [Voj11, Sect. 8] for a brief treatment with a few more details than are given here.

Throughout this section, k is a number field, and varieties and morphisms are implicitly taken to be over k.

Definition 3.1. *Let X be a variety.*

(a). *The set $X(M_k)$ is defined as*

$$X(M_k) = \coprod_{v \in M_k} X(\overline{k}_v)\ .$$

Here k_v is the completion of k at a place v, and $\overline{k}_v$ is an algebraic closure of k_v. By abuse of notation, if Z is a subset of X, then we write $X(M_k) \setminus Z$ to mean $(X \setminus Z)(M_k)$. The topology on $X(\overline{k}_v)$ is the topology determined by the (unique) extension of v to $\overline{k}_v$. A subset of $X(M_k)$ is open if and only if its intersection with $X(\overline{k}_v)$ is open for all $v \in M_k$.

(b). *An M_k-**constant** is a collection $c = (c_v)_{v \in M_k}$ of real numbers such that $c_v = 0$ for almost all v.*

(c). *Let D be a Cartier divisor on X. A **Weil function** for D is a function $\lambda_D \colon X(M_k) \setminus \operatorname{Supp} D \to \mathbb{R}$ that satisfies the following condition. For each Zariski-open subset U of X and each function*

$f \in K(X)^*$ such that the divisors D and (f) coincide on U, there is a continuous locally M_k-bounded function $\alpha\colon U(M_k) \to \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\lambda_D(x) = -\log \|f(x)\|_v + \alpha(x) \tag{13}$$

for all $v \in M_k$ and all $x \in U(\overline{k}_v) \setminus \operatorname{Supp} D$.

(d). *Let D be a Cartier divisor on X, and let v be a place of k. A **local Weil function** for D at v is a function $\lambda_{D,v}\colon X(\overline{k}_v) \setminus \operatorname{Supp} D \to \mathbb{R}$ that satisfies the following condition. For each Zariski-open subset U of X and each function $f \in K(X)^*$ such that the divisors D and (f) coincide on U, there is a locally bounded continuous function $\alpha\colon U(\overline{k}_v) \to \mathbb{R}$ such that*

$$\lambda_{D,v}(x) = -\log \|f(x)\|_v + \alpha(x)$$

for all $x \in U(\overline{k}_v) \setminus \operatorname{Supp} D$. (Local Weil functions are also called local heights.*)*

For the definition of locally M_k-bounded function, see Lang [Lan83, Ch. 10, Sect. 1]. The details of this definition are not really necessary for this paper, though. For this paper, it is enough to know that if $\alpha\colon U(M_k) \to \mathbb{R}$ is a locally M_k-bounded function, then its restriction to $U(\overline{k}_v)$ for any v is locally bounded and continuous. Conversely, any locally bounded continuous function $U(\overline{k}_v) \to \mathbb{R}$ extends to a locally M_k-bounded function on $U(M_k)$.

Because of this, if D is a Cartier divisor on a variety X, if λ_D is a Weil function for D, and if v is a place of k, then $\lambda_{D,v} := \lambda_D\big|_{X(\overline{k}_v)\setminus \operatorname{Supp} D}$ is a local Weil function for D at v. Conversely, given any finite collection S of places of k and local Weil functions for D at all $v \in S$, there is a Weil function λ_D for D such that $\lambda_{D,v}$ coincides with the given local Weil functions at all $v \in S$. In this paper, we will only use local Weil functions at finitely many places, so (global) Weil functions are not strictly speaking necessary here. They are only used because using local Weil functions would lead to the question of whether the condition depends on the choice of place of k. (Perhaps we could have defined a *semilocal Weil function* to be a collection of local Weil functions at finitely many places v. One could replace global Weil functions throughout this paper with such semilocal Weil functions without any loss of rigor.)

Given a complete variety X and a Cartier divisor D on X, there exists a Weil function for D. For a proof when X is projective, see [Lan83, Ch. 10, Thm. 3.5]. The proof in the general case is sketched in [Voj11, Thm. 8.7].

Existence of local Weil functions is much easier. For local Weil functions at an archimedean place v, we have $\overline{k}_v = \mathbb{C}$, so the method of (12) works. If v is non-archimedean, then one can make similar constructions using the

notion of v-adically metrized line sheaf due to S. Zhang [Zha95, Appendix]. Or, see the sketched proof in [Voj11, Thm. 8.7].

By [Lan83, Ch. 10, Lemma 1.4], if U is a nonempty open subset of X, then $U(M_k)$ is dense in $X(M_k)$ and $U(\overline{k}_v)$ is dense in $X(\overline{k}_v)$ for all v. (Lang works with $\overline{k}$ instead of $\overline{k}_v$, but the proofs are the same.) Therefore, if D is a Cartier divisor on a variety X, and if U is any nonempty subset of X disjoint from $\operatorname{Supp} D$, any function $\lambda\colon U(M_k) \to \mathbb{R}$ that satisfies (13) extends uniquely to a Weil function for D. This fact will be used frequently without specific mention.

If D is an effective divisor, then a Weil function λ_D for D may be extended to a function $\lambda_D\colon X(M_k) \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$.

Proposition 3.2. *Weil functions have the following properties. Let X be a variety.*

(a). ***Additivity.*** *If λ_1 and λ_2 are Weil functions for Cartier divisors D_1 and D_2 on X, respectively, then $\lambda_1 + \lambda_2$ extends uniquely to a Weil function for $D_1 + D_2$.*

(b). ***Functoriality.*** *If λ is a Weil function for a Cartier divisor D on X, and if $f\colon Y \to X$ is a morphism of k-varieties such that $f(Y) \not\subseteq \operatorname{Supp} D$, then $x \mapsto \lambda(f(x))$ is a Weil function for the Cartier divisor f^*D on Y.*

(c). ***Normalization.*** *If $X = \mathbb{P}^n_k$, and if D is the hyperplane at infinity, then the function*

$$\lambda_{D,v}([x_0 : \cdots : x_n]) := -\log \frac{\|x_0\|_v}{\max\{\|x_0\|_v, \dots, \|x_n\|_v\}}$$

is a Weil function for D. For the definition of $\|\cdot\|_v$, see [Voj11, Sect. 1]

Local Weil functions (at a given place v) also have these properties.

For proofs of these properties, see Lang [Lan83, Ch. 10].

Next we show which Weil functions correspond to effective Cartier divisors (in more generality than will be needed here), and use that result to derive a uniqueness result (Corollary 3.5).

Remark 3.3. On a normal variety, the Cartier divisors are exactly the locally principal Weil divisors [Har77, pp. II 6.11.2], and a Cartier divisor is effective as a Cartier divisor if and only if it is effective as a Weil divisor [Har77, II 6.3A].

Proposition 3.4. *Let X be a normal complete variety, let D be a Cartier divisor on X, and let λ_D be a Weil function for D. Then the following conditions are equivalent.*

(i) *D is effective.*
(ii) *λ_D is bounded from below by an M_k-constant.*
(iii) *for all $v \in M_k$, $\lambda_{D,v}$ is bounded from below.*
(iv) *there exists a $v \in M_k$ such that $\lambda_{D,v}$ is bounded from below.*

Proof. For the implication (i) $\Longrightarrow$ (ii), see [Lan83, Ch. 10, Prop. 3.1]. The implications (ii) $\Longrightarrow$ (iii) $\Longrightarrow$ (iv) are trivial.

To show that (iv) $\Longrightarrow$ (i), assume that D is not effective. By Remark 3.3, D (as a Weil divisor) has at least one component with negative multiplicity. Fix a closed point $x \in X$ that lies on that prime divisor, but not on any other irreducible component of $\operatorname{Supp} D$, and let U be a Zariski-open neighborhood of x. Take a sequence (x_n) of points in $U(\overline{k}_v) \setminus \operatorname{Supp} D$ that converges to x in the v-topology. Then the sequence $\lambda_{D,v}(x_n)$ goes to $-\infty$; thus $\lambda_{D,v}$ is not bounded from below. □

Corollary 3.5. *Let X be a complete variety (not necessarily normal), let D be a Cartier divisor on X, and let λ_1 and λ_2 be Weil functions for D. Then there are M_k-constants c and c' such that*

$$-c \le \lambda_1 - \lambda_2 \le c' .$$

Proof. By Proposition 3.2a we may assume that $D = 0$ and $\lambda_2 = 0$. The corollary is then immediate from Proposition 3.4 and Proposition 3.2b (pull back to the normalization). □

The following proposition is useful for constructing Weil functions via the "min-max" method. It will also be used later in this paper.

Proposition 3.6. *Let X be a variety; let $D_1, \dots, D_n$ and D be Cartier divisors on X; and let $\lambda_{D_1}, \dots, \lambda_{D_n}$ be Weil functions for $D_1, \dots, D_n$, respectively. Assume that $D_i - D$ is effective for all i, and that*

$$\bigcap_{i=1}^{n} \operatorname{Supp}(D_i - D) = \emptyset .$$

Then the function

$$\lambda_D := \min\{\lambda_{D_i} : i = 1, \dots, n\}$$

is a Weil function for the divisor D.

Proof. See Lang [Lan83, Ch. 10, Prop. 3.2]. □

A slightly more general statement will be used to rephrase Definition 1.7.

Lemma 3.7. *Let X be a projective variety, and let $U_1, \dots, U_n$ be Zariski-open subsets of X that cover X. Let $D_1, \dots, D_n$ be Cartier divisors on X such that $D_i\big|_{U_i}$ is effective for all i, and let λ_{D_i} be Weil functions for D_i for all i. Then there is an M_k-constant $\gamma = (\gamma_v)$ such that, for all v and all $x \in X(\overline{k}_v)$ there is an i such that $x \in U_i$ and $\lambda_{D_i,v}(x) \ge \gamma_v$.*

Proof. By taking a finite refinement of $\{U_i\}$, we may assume that each U_i is affine, and that $D_i\big|_{U_i} = (f_i)$ for some nonzero $f_i \in \mathscr{O}(U_i)$ for all i.

Then λ_{D_i} is locally M_k-bounded from below on $U_i(M_k)$ for all i. Indeed, by [Lan83, Ch. 10, Prop. 1.3], the function $-\log\|f_i\|$ is locally M_k-bounded from below on $U_i(M_k)$; therefore so is λ_{D_i} since by definition of Weil function and Néron function the difference between the two functions is locally M_k-bounded.

By [Lan83, Ch. 10, Prop. 1.2], there are affine M_k-bounded sets $E_1, \dots, E_n$ such that $\bigcup E_i = X(M_k)$ and such that $E_i \subseteq U_i(M_k)$ for all i.

By definition of locally M_k-bounded function (see [Lan83, Ch. 10, Sect. 1]), for each i there is an M_k-constant γ_i such that $\lambda_{D_i} \ge \gamma_i$ on E_i. This concludes the proof, with $\gamma = \min\{\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_n\}$. □

Remark 3.8. It is possible to prove Proposition 3.6 using Lemma 3.7 rather easily.

4. The General Theorem

In this section, we prove the General Theorem (in both the arithmetic and analytic cases) by using the filtration constructed by Autissier in [Aut11]. Before presenting the proof, we first discuss some consequences of the General Theorem, in addition to Theorems C and D discussed in the introduction.

4.1. **The equi-degree case.**

Using the General Theorem, we can derive a more precise (if not sharp) theorem of Schmidt's subspace theorem type (in the arithmetic case) and Nevanlinna's Second Main Theorem type (in the complex case) for the divisors which are (only) assumed to have equi-degree.

Definition 4.1. *Suppose that X is a complete variety of dimension n. Let $D_1, \dots, D_q$ be effective Cartier divisors on X, and let $D = D_1 + D_2 + \cdots + D_q$. We say that D **has equi-degree with respect to** $D_1, D_2, \dots, D_q$ if $D_i \,.\, D^{n-1} = \frac{1}{q} D^n$ for all $i = 1, \dots, q$.*

The important result associated to the concept of equi-degree is as follows.

Lemma 4.2 (Levin [Lev09, Lemma 9.7]). *Let X be a complete variety of dimension n. If $D_j, 1 \le j \le q$, are big and nef Cartier divisors, then there exist positive real numbers r_j such that $D = \sum_{j=1}^{q} r_j D_j$ has equi-degree.*

(In [Lev09], Levin assumed that X is projective, but his proof works more generally for complete varieties without change.)

Since divisors $r_j D_j$ and D_j have the same support, the above lemma tells us that we can always make the given big and nef divisors have equi-degree without changing their supports. This means that the condition of equi-degree, rather than the previous assumptions of linear or numerical equivalence for the divisors $D_1, \cdots, D_q$, is indeed a correct (or reasonable) assumption in the study of (quasi) hyperbolicity as well as the study of the degeneracy of integral points on the complement $X \backslash D$.

To compute $\gamma(D_j)$ for $j = 1, \ldots, q$, we use the following lemma of Autissier.

Lemma 4.3 ([Aut09, Lemma 4.2]). *Suppose E is a big and base-point free Cartier divisor on a projective variety X, and F is a nef Cartier divisor on X such that $F - E$ is also nef. Let $\beta > 0$ be a positive real number. Then, for any positive integers N and m with $1 \le m \le \beta N$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} h^0(NF - mE) \;\ge\; & \frac{F^n}{n!} N^n - \frac{F^{n-1} \,.\, E}{(n-1)!} N^{n-1} m \\ & + \frac{(n-1) F^{n-2} \,.\, E^2}{n!} N^{n-2} \min\{m^2, N^2\} + O(N^{n-1}) \end{aligned}$$

where the implicit constant depends on β.

We now compute $\sum_{m \ge 1} h^0(ND - mD_i)$ for each $1 \le i \le q$. Let $n = \dim X$, and assume that $n \ge 2$. Let $\beta = \frac{D^n}{nD^{n-1}.D_i}$ and $A = (n-1) D^{n-2} \,.\, D_i^2$. Then, by Lemma 4.3,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} h^0(ND - mD_i) \\ & \quad \ge \sum_{m=1}^{[\beta N]} \left(\frac{D^n}{n!} N^n - \frac{D^{n-1} \,.\, D_i}{(n-1)!} N^{n-1} m + \frac{A}{n!} N^{n-2} \min\{m^2, N^2\} \right) + O(N^n) \\ & \quad \ge \left(\frac{D^n}{n!} \beta - \frac{D^{n-1} \,.\, D_i}{(n-1)!} \frac{\beta^2}{2} + \frac{A}{n!} g(\beta) \right) N^{n+1} + O(N^n) \\ & \quad = \left(\frac{\beta}{2} + \frac{A}{D^n} g(\beta) \right) D^n \frac{N^{n+1}}{n!} + O(N^n) \\ & \quad = \left(\frac{\beta}{2} + \alpha \right) N h^0(ND) + O(N^n) \end{aligned}$$

where $\alpha := \frac{A}{D^n} g(\beta)$ and $g : \mathbb{R}^+ \to \mathbb{R}^+$ is the function given by $g(x) = \frac{x^3}{3}$ if $x \le 1$ and $g(x) = x - \frac{2}{3}$ for $x \ge 1$. Now from the assumption of equi-degree, $D_i \,.\, D^{n-1} = \frac{1}{q} D^n$, so $\beta = \frac{q}{n}$. Hence

$$\gamma(D_i) = \inf_N \frac{N h^0(ND)}{\sum_{m \ge 1} h^0(ND - mD_i)} \le \frac{1}{\frac{\beta}{2} + \alpha} < \frac{2n}{q}.$$

The General Theorem in Section 1 thus gives

Theorem 4.4 (Arithmetic Part)**.** *Let k be a number field and let $S \subseteq M_k$ be a finite set containing all archimedean places. Let X be a projective variety of dimension ≥ 2 over k, and let $D_1, \dots, D_q$ be ample Cartier divisors on X that intersect properly. Assume that $D := \sum_{j=1}^q D_j$ has equi-degree respect to $D_1, \dots, D_q$. Then, for $\epsilon_0 > 0$ small enough (which only depends on the given divisors), the inequality*

$$m_S(x, D) < \left(\frac{2 \dim X}{q} - \epsilon_0 \right) h_D(x)$$

holds for all k-rational points $x \in X(k)$ outside of a proper Zariski-closed subset of X.

Theorem 4.5 (Analytic Part)**.** *Let X be a complex projective variety of dimension ≥ 2, and let $D_1, \dots, D_q$ be ample Cartier divisors on X that intersect properly. Assume that $D := \sum_{j=1}^q D_j$ has equi-degree with respect to $D_1, \dots, D_q$. Let $f \colon \mathbb{C} \to X$ be a holomorphic map with Zariski-dense image. Then, for $\epsilon_0 > 0$ small enough,*

$$m_f(r, D) <_{\text{exc}} \left(\frac{2 \dim X}{q} - \epsilon_0 \right) T_{f,D}(r).$$

In general, we can prove

Theorem 4.6 (Arithmetic Part)**.** *Let k be a number field and let $S \subseteq M_k$ be a finite set containing all archimedean places. Let X be a projective variety of dimension ≥ 2 over k, and let $D_1, \dots, D_q$ be effective, big, and nef Cartier divisors on X that intersect properly. Let $r_i > 0$ be real numbers such that $D := \sum_{i=1}^q r_i D_i$ has equi-degree (such numbers exist due to Lemma 4.2). Then, for $\epsilon_0 > 0$ small enough, the inequality*

$$\sum_{j=1}^q r_j m_S(x, D_j) < \left(\frac{2 \dim X}{q} - \epsilon_0 \right) \left(\sum_{j=1}^q r_j h_{D_j}(x) \right)$$

holds for all $x \in X(k)$ outside a proper Zariski-closed subset of X.

Theorem 4.7 (Analytic Part)**.** *Let X be a complex projective variety of dimension ≥ 2, and let $D_1, \dots, D_q$ be effective, big, and nef Cartier divisors on X that intersect properly. Let $r_i > 0$ be real numbers such that $D :=$*

$\sum_{i=1}^q r_i D_i$ has equi-degree (such numbers exist due to Lemma 4.2). Let $f\colon \mathbb{C} \to X$ be a holomorphic map with Zariski-dense image. Then, for $\epsilon_0 > 0$ small enough,

$$\sum_{j=1}^{q} r_j m_f(r, D_j) <_{\text{exc}} \left(\frac{2\dim X}{q} - \epsilon_0\right)\left(\sum_{j=1}^{q} r_j T_{f,D_j}(r)\right).$$

The proofs of Theorems 4.6 and 4.7 are similar to the proofs of Theorems 4.4 and Theorem 4.5 above, except in this case, the divisor $D = \sum_{i=1}^q r_i D_i$ is an $\mathbb{R}$-divisor, so we need to approximate this divisor by a $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor $\widehat{D} := \sum_{i=1}^q a_i D_i$, similar to the argument carried out in [Ru15a] and [Ru15b]. We omit the proofs here. We note that Theorems 4.6 and 4.7 greatly improve the earlier results in [Ru15a] and [Ru15b].

4.2. **The proof of the General Theorem.** The proof of the General Theorems stated in Section 1 uses the the filtration constructed by Pascal Autissier (see [Aut11]). We first review his results.

Let $D_1, \ldots, D_r$ be effective Cartier divisors on a projective variety X. Assume that they intersect properly on X, and that $\bigcap_{i=1}^r D_i$ is non-empty. Let $\mathscr{L}$ be a line sheaf over X with $l := h^0(\mathscr{L}) \geq 1$.

Definition 4.8. *A subset $N \subset \mathbb{N}^r$ is said to be **saturated** if $\mathbf{a} + \mathbf{b} \in N$ for any $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{N}^r$ and $\mathbf{b} \in N$.*

Lemma 4.9 ([Aut11, Lemma 3.2])**.** *Let A be a local ring and $(\phi_1, \ldots, \phi_r)$ be a regular sequence of A. Let M and N be two saturated subsets of $\mathbb{N}^r$. Then*

$$\mathcal{I}(M) \cap \mathcal{I}(N) = \mathcal{I}(M \cap N),$$

where, for $N \subset \mathbb{N}^r$, $\mathcal{I}(N)$ is the ideal of A generated by $\{\phi_1^{b_1} \cdots \phi_q^{b_r} \mid \mathbf{b} \in N\}$.

Remark 4.10. We use Lemma 4.9 in the following particular situation: Let

$$\triangle = \{\mathbf{t} = (t_1, \ldots, t_r) \in (\mathbb{R}^+)^r \mid t_1 + \cdots + t_r = 1\}.$$

For each $\mathbf{t} \in \triangle$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^+$, let

$$N(\mathbf{t}, x) = \{\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{N}^r \mid t_1 b_1 + \cdots + t_r b_r \geq x\}.$$

Notice that $N(\mathbf{t}, x) \cap N(\mathbf{u}, y) \subset N(\lambda\mathbf{t} + (1-\lambda)\mathbf{u}, \lambda x + (1-\lambda)y)$ for all $\lambda \in [0, 1]$. So, from Lemma 4.9, we have

$$\mathcal{I}(N(\mathbf{t}, x)) \cap \mathcal{I}(N(\mathbf{u}, y)) \subset \mathcal{I}(N(\lambda\mathbf{t} + (1-\lambda)\mathbf{u}, \lambda x + (1-\lambda)y)) \tag{14}$$

for any $\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{u} \in \triangle$; $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^+$; and $\lambda \in [0, 1]$.

Definition 4.11. *Let W be a vector space of finite dimension. A **filtration** of W is a family of subspaces $\mathcal{F} = (\mathcal{F}_x)_{x\in\mathbb{R}^+}$ of subspaces of W such that $\mathcal{F}_x \supseteq \mathcal{F}_y$ whenever $x \le y$, and such that $\mathcal{F}_x = \{0\}$ for x big enough. A basis $\mathcal{B}$ of W is said to be **adapted to** $\mathcal{F}$ if $\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{F}_x$ is a basis of $\mathcal{F}_x$ for every real number $x \ge 0$.*

Lemma 4.12 (Levin [Lev09], Autissier [Aut11])**.** *Let $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{G}$ be two filtrations of W. Then there exists a basis of W which is adapted to both $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{G}$.*

For any fixed $\mathbf{t} \in \triangle$, we construct a filtration of $H^0(X, \mathscr{L})$ as follows: for $x \in \mathbb{R}^+$, one defines the ideal $\mathcal{I}(\mathbf{t}, x)$ of $\mathscr{O}_X$ by

$$\mathcal{I}(\mathbf{t}, x) = \sum_{\mathbf{b}\in N(\mathbf{t},x)} \mathscr{O}_X(-\sum_{i=1}^{r} b_i D_i) \ , \tag{15}$$

and let

$$\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{t})_x = H^0(X, \mathcal{I}(\mathbf{t}, x) \otimes \mathscr{L}) \ . \tag{16}$$

Then $(\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{t})_x)_{x\in\mathbb{R}^+}$ is a filtration of $H^0(X, \mathscr{L})$.

For $s \in H^0(X, \mathscr{L}) - \{0\}$, let $\mu_{\mathbf{t}}(s) = \sup\{y \in \mathbb{R}^+ \mid s \in \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{t})_y\}$. Also let

$$F(\mathbf{t}) = \frac{1}{h^0(\mathscr{L})} \int_0^{+\infty} (\dim \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{t})_x)\, dx \ . \tag{17}$$

Remark 4.13. Let $\mathcal{B} = \{s_1, \dots, s_l\}$ be a basis of $H^0(X, \mathscr{L})$ with $l = h^0(\mathscr{L})$. Then we have

$$F(\mathbf{t}) \ge \frac{1}{l} \int_0^{\infty} \#(\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{t})_x \cap \mathcal{B}) dx = \frac{1}{l} \sum_{k=1}^{l} \mu_{\mathbf{t}}(s_k),$$

where equality holds if $\mathcal{B}$ is adapted to the filtration $(\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{t})_x)_{x\in\mathbb{R}^+}$.

The key result we will use about this filtration is the following Proposition.

Proposition 4.14 ([Aut11, Théorème 3.6])**.** *With the notations and assumptions above, let $F : \triangle \to \mathbb{R}^+$ be the map defined in (17). Then F is concave. In particular, for $\mathbf{t} \in \triangle$,*

$$F(\mathbf{t}) \ge \min_i \left(\frac{1}{h^0(\mathscr{L})} \sum_{m\ge 1} h^0(\mathscr{L}(-mD_i)) \right) \ . \tag{18}$$

We include a proof here for the sake of completeness.

Proof. For any $\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{u} \in \triangle$ and $\lambda \in [0,1]$, we need to prove that

$$F(\lambda\mathbf{t} + (1-\lambda)\mathbf{u}) \geq \lambda F(\mathbf{t}) + (1-\lambda)F(\mathbf{u}). \tag{19}$$

By Lemma 4.12, there exists a basis $\mathcal{B} = \{s_1, \ldots, s_l\}$ of $H^0(X, \mathscr{L})$ with $l = h^0(\mathscr{L})$, which is adapted both to $(\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{t})_x)_{x\in\mathbb{R}^+}$ and to $(\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{u})_y)_{y\in\mathbb{R}^+}$. For $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^+$, by Lemma 4.9 (or Remark 4.10), since $D_1, \ldots, D_r$ intersect properly on X

$$\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{t})_x \cap \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{u})_y \subset \mathcal{F}(\lambda\mathbf{t} + (1-\lambda)\mathbf{u})_{\lambda x + (1-\lambda)y}.$$

For $s \in H^0(X, \mathscr{L}) - \{0\}$, we have, from the definition of $\mu_{\mathbf{t}}(s)$ and $\mu_{\mathbf{u}}(s)$, $s \in \mathcal{F}(\lambda\mathbf{t} + (1-\lambda)\mathbf{u})_{\lambda x+(1-\lambda)y}$ for $x < \mu_{\mathbf{t}}(s)$ and $y < \mu_{\mathbf{u}}(s)$, and thus

$$\mu_{\lambda\mathbf{t}+(1-\lambda)\mathbf{u}}(s) \geq \lambda\mu_{\mathbf{t}}(s) + (1-\lambda)\mu_{\mathbf{u}}(s).$$

Taking $s = s_j$ and summing it over $j = 1, \ldots, l$, we get, by Remark 4.13,

$$F(\lambda\mathbf{t} + (1-\lambda)\mathbf{u}) \geq \lambda\frac{1}{l}\sum_{j=1}^{l}\mu_{\mathbf{t}}(s_j) + (1-\lambda)\frac{1}{l}\sum_{j=1}^{l}\mu_{\mathbf{u}}(s_j).$$

On the other hand, since $\mathcal{B} = \{s_1, \ldots, s_l\}$ is a basis adapted to both $\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{t})$ and $\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{u})$, from Remark 4.13, $F(\mathbf{t}) = \frac{1}{l}\sum_{j=1}^{l}\mu_{\mathbf{t}}(s_j)$ and $F(\mathbf{u}) = \frac{1}{l}\sum_{j=1}^{l}\mu_{\mathbf{u}}(s_j)$. Thus

$$F(\lambda\mathbf{t} + (1-\lambda)\mathbf{u}) \geq \lambda F(\mathbf{t}) + (1-\lambda)F(\mathbf{u}),$$

which proves that F is a convex function.

To prove (18), let $\mathbf{e}_1 = (1, 0, \ldots, 0)$, $\cdots$, $\mathbf{e}_r = (0, 0, \ldots, 1)$ be the natural basis of $\mathbb{R}^r$, and write, for $\mathbf{t} \in \triangle$, $\mathbf{t} = t_1\mathbf{e_1} + \cdots + t_r\mathbf{e}_r$. Then, notice that $t_1 + \cdots + t_r = 1$, from the convexity of F, we get

$$F(\mathbf{t}) = F(t_1\mathbf{e_1} + \cdots + t_r\mathbf{e}_r) \geq (t_1 + \cdots + t_r)\min_i F(\mathbf{e}_i) = \min_i F(\mathbf{e}_i)$$

and, obviously, $F(\mathbf{e}_i) = \frac{1}{h^0(\mathscr{L})}\sum_{m\geq 1} h^0(\mathscr{L}(-mD_i))$ for $i = 1, \ldots, r$. □

We are now ready to prove the General Theorems. We first consider the arithmetic case.

Let $D_1, \ldots, D_q$ be effective Cartier divisors intersecting properly on X, and let $D = D_1 + \cdots + D_q$. Choose Weil functions $\lambda_{D_1}, \ldots, \lambda_{D_q}$ for the Cartier divisors $D_1, \ldots, D_q$, respectively. Since these divisors are effective, we may assume that $\lambda_{D_i,v}(y) \geq 0$ for all $i = 1, \ldots, q$; all $v \in S$; and all $y \in X(\overline{k}_v) \setminus \operatorname{Supp} D_i$ (this can be done by Proposition 3.4).

Let $\epsilon > 0$, and pick a positive integer N such that

$$\max_{1\leq j\leq q}\frac{Nh^0(\mathscr{L}^N)}{\sum_{m\geq 1} h^0(\mathscr{L}^N(-mD_j))} < \max_{1\leq j\leq q}\gamma(\mathscr{L}, D_j) + \frac{\epsilon}{4}\,. \tag{20}$$

Lemma 4.15 (similar to [Voj11, Lemma 20.7])**.** *Let X be a complete variety over a number field k; let $D_1, \dots, D_q$ be effective Cartier divisors on X; let $D = D_1 + \cdots + D_q$; and let $\lambda_{D_1}, \dots, \lambda_{D_q}$ be Weil functions for $D_1, \dots, D_q$, respectively. Let*

$$\Sigma = \left\{ \sigma \subseteq \{1, \dots, q\} \;\middle|\; \bigcap_{j \in \sigma} \operatorname{Supp} D_j \neq \emptyset \right\} .$$

For each $\sigma \in \Sigma$, write

$$D = D_{\sigma,1} + D_{\sigma,2} , \tag{21}$$

where

$$D_{\sigma,1} = \sum_{j \in \sigma} D_j \qquad \text{and} \qquad D_{\sigma,2} = \sum_{j \notin \sigma} D_j .$$

Let $\lambda_{D_{\sigma,2}} = \sum_{j \notin \sigma} \lambda_{D_j}$ for all $\sigma \in \Sigma$. Then there exists an M_k-constant $(C_v)_{v \in M_k}$, depending only on X; $D_1, \dots, D_q$; and the chosen Weil functions, such that

$$\min_{\sigma \in \Sigma} \lambda_{D_{\sigma,2},v}(x) \leq C_v$$

for all $x \in X(\overline{k}_v)$ and all $v \in M_k$.

Proof. The definition of the set Σ implies that

$$\bigcap_{\sigma \in \Sigma} \operatorname{Supp} D_{\sigma,2} = \emptyset,$$

because for all $x \in X$ the set $\sigma = \{j \in \{1, \dots, q\} \mid x \in \operatorname{Supp} D_j\}$ is an element in Σ, and then $x \notin \operatorname{Supp} D_{\sigma,2}$. The lemma then follows from Proposition 3.6 and Corollary 3.5, since Σ is a finite set. □

Let $c \geq 1$ be an integer such that $h^0(\mathscr{L}^N(-cD_j)) = 0$ for $j = 1, \dots, q$ and fix an integer b with $b \geq \frac{cn}{N\epsilon_0}$, where $\epsilon_0 > 0$ is chosen such that

$$\epsilon_0 < \frac{\epsilon}{(\max_{1 \leq j \leq q} \gamma(\mathscr{L}, D_j) + 1 + \epsilon)(4 \max_{1 \leq j \leq q} \gamma(\mathscr{L}, D_j) + 1 + \epsilon)}.$$

For $\sigma \in \Sigma$, let

$$\triangle_\sigma = \left\{ \mathbf{a} = (a_i) \in \mathbb{N}^{\#\sigma} \mid \sum_{i \in \sigma} a_i = b \right\}.$$

For $\mathbf{a} \in \triangle_\sigma$ (hence $\frac{1}{b}\mathbf{a} \in \triangle$), as above, one defines (see (15), (16), and (17)) the ideal $\mathscr{I}(x)$ of $\mathscr{O}_X$ by

$$\mathscr{I}(x) = \sum_{\mathbf{b}} \mathscr{O}_X \left(- \sum_{i \in \sigma} b_i D_i \right)$$

where the sum is taken for all $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{N}^{\#\sigma}$ with $\sum_{i\in\sigma} a_i b_i \geq bx$. Let

$$\mathcal{F}(\sigma;\mathbf{a})_x = H^0(X, \mathscr{L}^N \otimes \mathcal{I}(x)) \ ,$$

which we regard as a subspace of $H^0(X, \mathscr{L}^N)$, and let

$$F(\sigma;\mathbf{a}) = \frac{1}{h^0(\mathscr{L}^N)} \int_0^{+\infty} (\dim \mathcal{F}(\sigma;\mathbf{a})_x)\, dx \ .$$

Applying Proposition 4.14 with the line sheaf being taken as $\mathscr{L}^N$, we have

$$F(\sigma;\mathbf{a}) \geq \min_{1\leq i\leq q} \left(\frac{1}{h^0(\mathscr{L}^N)} \sum_{m\geq 1} h^0(\mathscr{L}^N(-mD_i)) \right) .$$

Let $\mathcal{B}_{\sigma;\mathbf{a}}$ be a basis of $H^0(X, \mathscr{L}^N)$ adapted to the above filtration $\{\mathcal{F}(\sigma;\mathbf{a})_x\}_{x\in\mathbb{R}^+}$. By Remark 4.13, $F(\sigma,\mathbf{a}) = \frac{1}{h^0(\mathscr{L}^N)} \sum_{s\in\mathcal{B}_{\sigma;\mathbf{a}}} \mu(s)$, where $\mu(s)$ is the largest rational number for which $s \in \mathcal{F}(\sigma;\mathbf{a})_\mu$. Hence

$$\sum_{s\in\mathcal{B}_{\sigma;\mathbf{a}}} \mu(s) \geq \min_{1\leq i\leq q} \sum_{m\geq 1} h^0(\mathscr{L}^N(-mD_i)) \ . \tag{22}$$

It is important to note that the set $\bigcup_{\sigma;\mathbf{a}} \mathcal{B}_{\sigma;\mathbf{a}}$ is a finite set.

Let

$$\lambda_D = \sum_{j=1}^{q} \lambda_{D_j} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \lambda_{D_{\sigma,1}} = \sum_{j\in\sigma} \lambda_{D_j} \quad \text{for all } \sigma \in \Sigma$$

(note that $\lambda_{D_{\sigma,2}}$ was defined already in Lemma 4.15).

Given $\sigma \in \Sigma$ and $\mathbf{a} \in \triangle_\sigma$, any nonzero section $s \in H^0(X, \mathscr{L}^N)$ can be written locally as

$$s = \sum_{\mathbf{b}} f_{\mathbf{b}} \prod_{i\in\sigma} 1_{D_i}^{b_i} \ ,$$

where $f_{\mathbf{b}}$ is a local section of $\mathscr{L}^N(-\sum_{i\in\sigma} b_i D_i)$, 1_{D_i} is the canonical section of $\mathscr{O}(D_i)$ for each i, and the sum is taken for all $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{N}^{\#\sigma}$ with $\sum_{i\in\sigma} a_i b_i \geq b\mu(s)$. Moreover, $f_{\mathbf{b}} = 0$ for all but finitely many $\mathbf{b}$.

By a compactness argument, there exist a finite covering $\{U_j\}_{j\in J_{\sigma,\mathbf{a},s}}$ of X by Zariski-open sets and a finite set $K = K_{\sigma,\mathbf{a},s} \subseteq \mathbb{N}^{\#\sigma}$ such that

$$s = \sum_{\mathbf{b}\in K} f_{s,j;\mathbf{b}} \prod_{i\in\sigma} 1_{D_i}^{b_i} \tag{23}$$

on U_j for all $j \in J_{\sigma,\mathbf{a},s}$, where $f_{s,j;\mathbf{b}} \in \Gamma(U_j, \mathscr{L}^N(-\sum_{i\in\sigma} b_i D_i))$ and all $\mathbf{b} \in K$ satisfy $\sum_{i\in\sigma} a_i b_i \geq b\mu(s)$.

Lemma 4.16. *For each $v \in S$ there is a constant c_v (which depends also on ϵ and the choices of Weil functions λ_s) with the following property. Pick $\sigma \in \Sigma$, $\mathbf{a} \in \triangle_\sigma$, and $s \in \mathcal{B}_{\sigma;\mathbf{a}}$, and choose a Weil function λ_s for the divisor (s). Then, for each $v \in S$,*

$$\lambda_{s,v}(P) \ge \min_{\mathbf{b}} \sum_{i\in\sigma} b_i \lambda_{D_i,v}(P) + c_v \tag{24}$$

for all $P \in X(k)$, where the minimum is taken over all $\mathbf{b} \in K$ as in (23).

Proof. For all $\sigma \in \Sigma$, all $\mathbf{a} \in \triangle_\sigma$, all $s \in \mathcal{B}_{\sigma;\mathbf{a}}$, all $j \in J_{\sigma,\mathbf{a},s}$, and all $v \in S$ there are constants $c_{v;j,\sigma,\mathbf{a}}$ such that, for all P in a v-bounded subset of $U_j(k_v)$,

$$\lambda_{s,v}(P) \ge \min_{\mathbf{b}} \sum_{i\in\sigma} b_i \lambda_{D_i,v}(P) + c_{v;j,\sigma,\mathbf{a}} \; . \tag{25}$$

These bounded subsets can be chosen to cover all of $X(k_v)$. This gives (24), since the sets Σ, $\triangle_\sigma$, $\mathcal{B}_{\sigma;\mathbf{a}}$, and $J_{\sigma,\mathbf{a},s}$ are finite.

Note also that (25) for all $P \in X(\overline{k})$ follows from Proposition 6.16. □

We may further assume that the sets $K = K_{\sigma,\mathbf{a},s}$ in Lemma 4.16 contain no $\mathbf{b}$ for which $f_{s,j;\mathbf{b}} = 0$ for all s and j. In particular, since $H^0(X, \mathscr{L}^N(-cD_j)) = 0$ for all j, we may assume that all $\mathbf{b} \in K$ satisfy $b_j < c$ for all j. Also, from the assumption that $D_1, \dots, D_q$ intersect properly (and hence lie in general position), we have $\#\sigma_{P,v} \le n$. Therefore, by the choice of the integer b, we may assume that all $\mathbf{b} \in K$ in (24) satisfy

$$\sum_{i\in\sigma} b_i \le nc \le bN\epsilon_0 \; . \tag{26}$$

Now for $P \in X(k)$ and $v \in S$ pick $\sigma_{P,v} \in \Sigma$ in Lemma 4.15 such that

$$\lambda_{D_{\sigma_{P,v},2},v}(P) \le C_v \tag{27}$$

where C_v is the M_k-constant appearing in Lemma 4.15, which depends only on X; $D_1, \dots, D_q$; and the chosen Weil functions.

For $i \in \sigma_{P,v}$ we let

$$t_{P,v;i} = \frac{\lambda_{D_i,v}(P)}{\sum_{j\in\sigma_{P,v}} \lambda_{D_j,v}(P)}. \tag{28}$$

Note that $\sum_{i\in\sigma_{P,v}} t_{P,v;i} = 1$. Choose $\mathbf{a}_{P,v} = (a_{P,v;i}) \in \triangle_{\sigma_{P,v}}$ such that

$$|bt_{P,v;i} - a_{P,v;i}| \le 1 \qquad \text{for all } i \in \sigma_{P,v}. \tag{29}$$

Using (24) with $\sigma = \sigma_{P,v}$ and $\mathbf{a} = \mathbf{a}_{P,v}$, (28), (29), and (26), we get, for any $s \in \mathcal{B}_{\sigma;\mathbf{a}}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\lambda_{s,v}(P) &\geq \min_{\mathbf{b}\in K} \sum_{i\in\sigma_{P,v}} b_i \lambda_{D_i,v}(P) + O_v(1) \\
&= \left(\sum_{j\in\sigma_{P,v}} \lambda_{D_j,v}(P)\right) \min_{\mathbf{b}\in K} \sum_{i\in\sigma_{P,v}} b_i t_{P,v;i} + O_v(1) \\
&\geq \left(\sum_{j\in\sigma_{P,v}} \lambda_{D_j,v}(P)\right) \min_{\mathbf{b}\in K} \sum_{i\in\sigma_{P,v}} b_i \frac{a_{P,v;i}-1}{b} + O_v(1) \\
&\geq (\mu(s) - N\epsilon_0) \left(\sum_{j\in\sigma_{P,v}} \lambda_{D_j,v}(P)\right) + O_v(1),
\end{aligned} \tag{30}$$

where the set K is as in (23). Therefore, by (30), (22), the definition of $\lambda_{D_{\sigma,1}}$, and (27), we have

(31)

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{s\in\mathcal{B}_{P,\sigma}} \lambda_{s,v}(P) &\geq \left(\sum_{s\in\mathcal{B}_{P,\sigma}} (\mu(s) - N\epsilon_0)\right) \left(\sum_{i\in\sigma_{P,v}} \lambda_{D_i,v}(P)\right) + O_v(1) \\
&\geq \left(\min_{1\leq i\leq q} \sum_{m\geq 1} h^0(\mathscr{L}^N(-mD_i)) - Nl\epsilon_0\right) \left(\sum_{i\in\sigma_{P,v}} \lambda_{D_i,v}(P)\right) + O_v(1) \\
&= \left(\min_{1\leq i\leq q} \sum_{m\geq 1} h^0(\mathscr{L}^N(-mD_i)) - Nl\epsilon_0\right) \lambda_{D_{\sigma_{P,v},1},v}(P) + O_v(1) \\
&= \left(\min_{1\leq i\leq q} \sum_{m\geq 1} h^0(\mathscr{L}^N(-mD_i)) - Nl\epsilon_0\right) \lambda_{D,v}(P) + O_v(1)\ ,
\end{aligned}$$

where $l = h^0(\mathscr{L}^N)$.

For any basis $\mathcal{B}$ of $H^0(X, \mathscr{L}^N)$, we recall the notation $(\mathcal{B})$ from (3):

$$(\mathcal{B}) = \sum_{s\in\mathcal{B}} (s).$$

For such $\mathcal{B}$, choose a Weil function $\lambda_{\mathcal{B}}$ for the divisor $(\mathcal{B})$; then (31) gives

$$\max_{\sigma;\mathbf{a}} \lambda_{\mathcal{B}_{\sigma;\mathbf{a}}} \geq \left(\min_{1\leq i\leq q} \sum_{m\geq 1} h^0(\mathscr{L}^N(-mD_i)) - Nl\epsilon_0\right) \lambda_{D,v} + O_v(1)\ . \tag{32}$$

Thus from the definition of $\mathrm{Nev}_{\mathrm{bir}}(\mathscr{L}, D)$ (see Definition 1.2) and by (20), we get

$$\mathrm{Nev}_{\mathrm{bir}}(\mathscr{L}, D) \le \max_{1\le j\le q} \gamma(\mathscr{L}, D_j)$$

and thus the General Theorem follows from Theorem 1.4. This finishes the proof.

Note that we can continue the proof without using the notion of $\mathrm{Nev}_{\mathrm{bir}}(\mathscr{L}, D_j)$ and Theorem 1.4. Indeed write

$$\bigcup_{\sigma;\mathbf{a}} \mathcal{B}_{\sigma;\mathbf{a}} = \mathcal{B}_1 \cup \cdots \cup \mathcal{B}_{T_1} = \{s_1, \dots, s_{T_2}\}.$$

For each $i = 1, \dots, T_1$, let $J_i \subseteq \{1, \dots, T_2\}$ be the subset such that $\mathcal{B}_i = \{s_j : j \in J_i\}$. Then, by (32), for each $v \in S$,

(33)
$$\begin{aligned}\left(\min_{1\le i\le q} \sum_{m\ge 1} h^0(\mathscr{L}^N(-mD_i)) - Nl\epsilon_0\right) \lambda_{D,v} &\le \max_{1\le i\le T_1} \lambda_{\mathcal{B}_i,v} + O_v(1)\\ &= \max_{1\le i\le T_1} \sum_{j\in J_i} \lambda_{s_j,v} + O_v(1).\end{aligned}$$

By Theorem 2.7 with ϵ in Theorem 2.7 taken as $\frac{\epsilon}{4\max_{1\le j\le q}\gamma(\mathscr{L},D_j)+1+\epsilon}$, there is a proper Zariski-closed subset Z of X such that the inequality

$$\sum_{v\in S} \max_J \sum_{j\in J} \lambda_{s_j,v}(x) \le \left(l + \frac{\epsilon}{4\max_{1\le j\le q}\gamma(\mathscr{L}, D_j) + 1 + \epsilon}\right) h_{ND}(x) \tag{34}$$

holds for all $x \in X(k)$ outside of Z; here $l = h^0(\mathscr{L}^N)$ and the maximum is taken over all subsets J of $\{1, \dots, T_2\}$ for which the sections s_j, $j \in J$, are linearly independent.

Combining (33) and (34) gives

$$\sum_{v\in S} \lambda_{D,v}(x) \le \frac{l + \frac{\epsilon}{4\max_{1\le j\le q}\gamma(\mathscr{L},D_j)+1+\epsilon}}{\min_{1\le i\le q}\sum_{m\ge 1} h^0(\mathscr{L}^N(-mD_i)) - Nl\epsilon_0} h_{\mathscr{L}^N}(x)$$

for all $x \in X(k)$ outside of Z. Here we used the fact that all of the J_i occur among the J in (34). Using (20), the fact that $l = h^0(\mathscr{L}^N)$ and $h_{\mathscr{L}^N}(x) = Nh_{\mathscr{L}}(x)$, we have, for $x \in X(k)$ outside of a proper Zariski-closed subset Z of X,

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{v\in S} \lambda_{D,v}(x) &\le \frac{(\max_{1\le j\le q}\gamma(\mathscr{L}, D_j) + \frac{\epsilon}{4})(1 + \frac{\epsilon}{4\max_{1\le j\le q}\gamma(\mathscr{L},D_j)+\epsilon})}{1 - (\max_{1\le j\le q}\gamma(\mathscr{L}, D_j) + \frac{\epsilon}{4})\epsilon_0} h_D(x)\\ &\le (\max_{1\le j\le q}\gamma(\mathscr{L}, D_j) + \epsilon) h_D(x),\end{aligned}$$

from our choice of ϵ_0. This proves the General Theorem for the arithmetic case.

The proof in the analytic case is similar, by replacing Theorem 2.7 (Schmidt's Subspace Theorem) with Theorem 2.8 (H. Cartan's theorem).

Remark 4.17. With notation as in Definition 1.8, let

$$\gamma'(\mathscr{L}, D) = \inf_{N,V} \frac{N \dim V}{\sum_{m\geq 1} \dim(V \cap H^0(X, \mathscr{L}^N(-mD)))} , \tag{35}$$

where the infimum is over all positive integers N and all linear subspaces V of $H^0(X, \mathscr{L}^N)$, and the fraction is taken to be $+\infty$ if the denominator is zero. Here we identify $H^0(X, \mathscr{L}^N(-mD))$ with a subspace of $H^0(X, \mathscr{L}^N)$ via the injection gotten by tensoring with 1_D^m. Then the General Theorems remain true when γ is replaced by γ'. The same proof works with minimal changes, but we have not included it here because we know of no applications so far.

5. The Birational Nevanlinna Constant

The goal of this section and the next two sections is to prove that the two definitions (Definitions 1.2 and 1.7) of the birational Nevanlinna constant $\mathrm{Nev}_{\mathrm{bir}}(D)$ given in Section 1 are equivalent.

We first recall the definition of the Nevalinna constant $\mathrm{Nev}(D)$ introduced by the first author (Definition 1.1), as well as the important results regarding $\mathrm{Nev}(D)$.

Definition 5.1 (see [Ru15a] and [Ru15b])**.** *Let X be a normal projective variety, and let D be an effective Cartier divisor on X. The* ***Nevanlinna constant*** *of D, denoted $\mathrm{Nev}(D)$, is given by*

$$\mathrm{Nev}(D) = \inf_{N,V,\mu} \frac{\dim V}{\mu} , \tag{36}$$

where the infimum is taken over all triples (N, V, μ) such that N is a positive integer, V is a linear subspace of $H^0(X, \mathscr{L}^N)$ with $\dim V \geq 2$, and μ is a positive real number such that, for all $P \in \mathrm{Supp}\, D$, there exists a basis $\mathcal{B}$ of V with

$$\sum_{s\in\mathcal{B}} \mathrm{ord}_E(s) \geq \mu \, \mathrm{ord}_E(ND) \tag{37}$$

for all irreducible components E of D passing through P. If $\dim H^0(X, \mathscr{O}(ND)) \leq 1$ for all positive integers N, we define $\mathrm{Nev}(D) = +\infty$. For a general complete variety X, $\mathrm{Nev}(D)$ is defined by pulling back to the normalization of X.

Next, we rephrase the definition of $\mathrm{Nev}(D)$. Recall from (3) that if $\mathcal{B}$ is a finite set of global sections of a line sheaf $\mathscr{L}$ on a variety X, then $(\mathcal{B})$ denotes the divisor

$$(\mathcal{B}) = \sum_{s\in\mathcal{B}}(s) \ .$$

First of all, notice that the divisor D plays two separate roles in Definition 5.1: the role in (37), and the space $H^0(X, \mathscr{O}(ND))$. At times it will be convenient to separate those two roles, so we introduce a line sheaf $\mathscr{L}$ and replace $H^0(X, \mathscr{O}(ND))$ with $H^0(X, \mathscr{L}^N)$.

Next, we can impose (37) on all divisor components passing through P (not just those occurring in D). Also, since we are taking the infimum in Definition 5.1, we can require μ to be rational.

With these two changes, the condition on the triple is equivalent to requiring that the $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor $(\mathcal{B}) - \mu ND$ be effective near P.

This leads to the following definition.

Definition 5.2. *Let X be a complete variety, let D be an effective Cartier divisor on X, and let $\mathscr{L}$ be a line sheaf on X. If X is normal, then we define*

$$\mathrm{Nev}(\mathscr{L}, D) = \inf_{N,V,\mu} \frac{\dim V}{\mu} \ .$$

Here the inf is taken over all triples (N, V, μ) such that $N \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, V is a linear subspace of $H^0(X, \mathscr{L}^N)$ with $\dim V > 1$, and $\mu > 0$ is a rational number, that satisfy the following property. For all $P \in X$ there is a basis $\mathcal{B}$ of V such that

$$(\mathcal{B}) \ge \mu ND \tag{38}$$

in a Zariski-open neighborhood U of P, relative to the cone of effective $\mathbb{Q}$-divisors on U. If there are no such triples (N, V, μ), then $\mathrm{Nev}(\mathscr{L}, D)$ is defined to be $+\infty$. For a general complete variety X, $\mathrm{Nev}(\mathscr{L}, D)$ is defined by pulling back to the normalization of X.

Note that $\mathrm{Nev}(\mathscr{O}(D), D)$ (as defined above) coincides with $\mathrm{Nev}(D)$ as in Definition 5.1.

To prove the equivalence, we start by recalling the second definition of $\mathrm{Nev}_{\mathrm{bir}}(D)$ (Definition 1.7) given in Section 1:

Definition 5.3 (see Definition 1.7)**.** *Let X be a complete variety, let D be an effective Cartier divisor on X, and let $\mathscr{L}$ be a line sheaf on X. If X is normal, then we define*

$$\mathrm{Nev}_{\mathrm{bir}}(\mathscr{L}, D) = \inf_{N,V,\mu} \frac{\dim V}{\mu} \ ,$$

where the infimum passes over all triples (N, V, μ) such that $N \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, V is a linear subspace of $H^0(X, \mathscr{L}^N)$ with $\dim V > 1$, and $\mu \in \mathbb{Q}_{>0}$, with the following property. There are a variety Y and a proper birational morphism $\phi\colon Y \to X$ such that the following condition holds. For all $Q \in Y$ there is a basis $\mathcal{B}$ of V such that

$$\phi^*(\mathcal{B}) \geq \mu N \phi^* D \tag{39}$$

in a Zariski-open neighborhood U of Q, relative to the cone of effective $\mathbb{Q}$-divisors on U. If there are no such triples (N, V, μ), then $\mathrm{Nev}_{\mathrm{bir}}(\mathscr{L}, D)$ is defined to be $+\infty$. For a general complete variety X, $\mathrm{Nev}_{\mathrm{bir}}(\mathscr{L}, D)$ is defined by pulling back to the normalization of X.

If L is a Cartier divisor or Cartier divisor class on X, then we define $\mathrm{Nev}_{\mathrm{bir}}(L, D) = \mathrm{Nev}_{\mathrm{bir}}(\mathscr{O}(L), D)$. We also define $\mathrm{Nev}_{\mathrm{bir}}(D) = \mathrm{Nev}_{\mathrm{bir}}(D, D)$.

(Note that a *birational morphism* from X to Y is a morphism $X \to Y$ that has an inverse as a rational map; in other words, it is a rational map $X \dashrightarrow Y$ that is defined everywhere on X.)

Remark 5.4. It is easy to see from the definitions that if n is a positive integer then

$$\mathrm{Nev}(\mathscr{L}, nD) = n\,\mathrm{Nev}(\mathscr{L}, D) \qquad \text{and} \qquad \mathrm{Nev}_{\mathrm{bir}}(\mathscr{L}, nD) = n\,\mathrm{Nev}_{\mathrm{bir}}(\mathscr{L}, D)\ .$$

We have the following easy comparison.

Lemma 5.5. *Let X, D, and $\mathscr{L}$ be as in Definitions 5.2 and 5.3. Then*

$$\mathrm{Nev}_{\mathrm{bir}}(\mathscr{L}, D) \leq \mathrm{Nev}(\mathscr{L}, D)\ .$$

Proof. We may assume that X is normal, because in both Definition 5.2 and Definition 5.3 the general case is handled by pulling back to the normalization.

If a triple (N, V, μ) satisfies the condition of Definition 5.2, then it also satisfies the condition of Definition 5.3, because in the latter condition we can take $Y = X$ and let ϕ be the identity map. Thus, the infimum in Definition 5.3 is being taken over a larger set. □

The only difference between the definitions is that in $\mathrm{Nev}_{\mathrm{bir}}(\mathscr{L}, D)$, the basis $\mathcal{B}$ is allowed to be taken locally on a blowing-up of X, rather than on X itself.

We now show that $\mathrm{Nev}_{\mathrm{bir}}$ can be viewed as a *birationalization* of Nev.

Proposition 5.6. *Let X be a complete variety over a number field k, let D be an effective Cartier divisor on X, and let $\mathscr{L}$ be a line sheaf on X. Then:*

(a). $\mathrm{Nev}_{\mathrm{bir}}(\mathscr{L}, D)$ *is a birational invariant, in the sense that if* $\phi\colon Y \to X$ *is a model of* X*, then*

$$\mathrm{Nev}_{\mathrm{bir}}(\phi^*\mathscr{L}, \phi^*D) = \mathrm{Nev}_{\mathrm{bir}}(\mathscr{L}, D) \ .$$

(b). *For all* $\epsilon > 0$ *there is a model* $\phi\colon Y \to X$ *of* X *such that*

$$\mathrm{Nev}(\phi^*\mathscr{L}, \phi^*D) < \mathrm{Nev}_{\mathrm{bir}}(\mathscr{L}, D) + \epsilon \ .$$

(c). *In particular,*

$$\mathrm{Nev}_{\mathrm{bir}}(\mathscr{L}, D) = \inf_{\phi\colon Y \to X} \mathrm{Nev}(\phi^*\mathscr{L}, \phi^*D) \ ,$$

where the infimum is over all models of X*.*

Proof. (a). This is clear from Definition 5.3, since the condition on (N, V, μ) remains true if Y is replaced by another variety Y' that dominates Y (i.e., there is a proper birational morphism $Y' \to X$ that factors through Y).

(b). Let (N, V, μ) be a triple satisfying the condition of Definition 5.3, for which

$$\frac{\dim V}{\mu} < \mathrm{Nev}_{\mathrm{bir}}(\mathscr{L}, D) + \epsilon \ ,$$

and let $\phi\colon Y \to X$ be as in Definition 5.3. Then the triple (N, ϕ^*V, μ) satisfies the condition of Definition 5.2 for $\mathrm{Nev}(\phi^*\mathscr{L}, \phi^*D)$. This proves (b).

(c). This part is immediate from part (b) and from Lemma 5.5. □

To conclude this section, we prove the following Proposition which would lead to the equivalence of the two definitions of $\mathrm{Nev}_{\mathrm{bir}}(D)$.

Proposition 5.7. *Let* X *be a normal complete variety over a number field, let* D *be an effective Cartier divisor on* X*, let* $\mathscr{L}$ *be a line sheaf on* X*, let* V *be a linear subspace of* $H^0(X, \mathscr{L})$ *with* $\dim V > 1$*, and let* $\mu > 0$ *be a rational number.*

Consider the following conditions.

(i) *There are a variety* Y *and a proper birational morphism* $\phi\colon Y \to X$ *such that for all* $Q \in Y$ *there is a basis* $\mathcal{B}$ *of* V *such that*

$$\phi^*(\mathcal{B}) \geq \mu\phi^*D$$

in a Zariski-open neighborhood U *of* Q*, relative to the cone of effective* $\mathbb{Q}$*-divisors on* U*.*

(ii) *There are finitely many bases* $\mathcal{B}_1, \dots, \mathcal{B}_\ell$ *of* V*; Weil functions* $\lambda_{\mathcal{B}_1}, \dots, \lambda_{\mathcal{B}_\ell}$ *for the divisors* $(\mathcal{B}_1), \dots, (\mathcal{B}_\ell)$*, respectively; a Weil function* λ_D *for* D*; and an* M_k*-constant* c *such that*

$$\max_{1 \leq i \leq \ell} \lambda_{\mathcal{B}_i} \geq \mu\lambda_D - c \tag{40}$$

(as functions $X(M_k) \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$*).*

If (i) is true, then so is (ii).

Proof. Assume that (i) holds.

By quasi-compactness, we may assume that only finitely many open subsets U occur in (i). Let $U_1, \ldots, U_\ell$ be a collection of such subsets. Since the condition on $\mathcal{B}$ only depends on U, we may fix a basis $\mathcal{B}_i$ for each open subset U_i. Also, for each i let $\lambda_{\mathcal{B}_i}$ be a Weil function for the divisor $(\mathcal{B}_i)$, and let λ_D be a Weil function for D.

Fix a positive integer n such that $n\mu \in \mathbb{Z}$, and such that the divisor $n\phi^*(\mathcal{B}_i) - n\mu\phi^*D$ is effective on U_i for all i. The above Weil functions can be pulled back to give Weil functions for $\phi^*(\mathcal{B}_i)$ and ϕ^*D, respectively, on Y.

By Lemma 3.7 applied to the divisors $D_i := n\phi^*(\mathcal{B}_i) - n\mu\phi^*D$ for all i and to the open sets $U_1, \ldots, U_\ell$, there is an M_k-constant γ such that

$$\max_{i=1,\ldots,\ell} \big(n\phi^*\lambda_{\mathcal{B}_i} - n\mu\phi^*\lambda_D\big) \geq \gamma \, .$$

Therefore (ii) holds, with $c = -\gamma/n$. □

The converse will be proved in the next section (Proposition 6.12).

6. Models of Varieties, b-divisors, and b-Weil Functions

In light of the birational nature of $\mathrm{Nev}_{\mathrm{bir}}$, it is useful to consider birationalizations of the definitions of Cartier divisor and Weil function. (Birational variants of Cartier divisors have already been developed as part of the minimal model program.) These allow one to finish the proof of Proposition 5.7, and therefore to show that $\mathrm{Nev}_{\mathrm{bir}}$ can be defined using Weil functions. (This was the original definition of $\mathrm{Nev}_{\mathrm{bir}}$.)

In this section, we define the notion of b-Cartier b-divisor, and show that the group of these objects (on a fixed variety X over some field), when partially ordered by the condition that $\mathbf{D}_1 \geq \mathbf{D}_2$ if $\mathbf{D}_1 - \mathbf{D}_2$ is effective, forms a lattice (i.e., a partially ordered set in which every nonempty finite set has a least upper bound and a greatest lower bound). We then define the related concept of b-Weil function on X, and show that a corresponding group (obtained by modding out by the subgroup of M_k-bounded functions) is also a lattice, and is naturally isomorphic to the partially ordered group of b-Cartier b-divisors on X.

Once these b-divisors and b-Weil functions have been defined and their elementary properties discussed, the main result of this section (Proposition 6.12) is stated and proved. This result gives alternative descriptions of the

main condition of Definition 5.3 using b-Cartier b-divisors and using b-Weil functions.

We begin by recalling some definitions from the minimal model program (the Mori program). The notion of b-divisor is originally due to Shokurov; see [Cor07, Def. 1.7.4 and § 2.3] for details. The prefix 'b' stands for *birational*.

Definition 6.1. *Let X be a complete variety over a field k.*

(a). *A **model** of X is a proper birational morphism $Y \to X$ over k, where Y is a variety over k. We often use Y to denote the model.*

(b). *The category of models of X is the category whose objects are models of X and whose morphisms are morphisms over X. We say that a model Y_1 of X **dominates** a model Y_2 of X if there is a morphism $Y_1 \to Y_2$ (necessarily unique) in this category.*

(c). *A **b-Cartier b-divisor** on X is an equivalence class of pairs (Y, D), where Y is a model of X and D is a Cartier divisor on Y; here equivalence classes are those for the equivalence relation generated by the relation $(Y_1, D_1) \sim (Y_2, D_2)$ if Y_1 dominates Y_2 via $\phi\colon Y_1 \to Y_2$, and $D_1 = \phi^* D_2$.*

(d). *A b-Cartier b-divisor $\mathbf{D}$ on X is **effective** if it is represented by a pair (Y, D) such that D is effective.*

Remark 6.2. Definition 6.1(c) is different from the definition given in [Cor07], but it is equivalent. In *op. cit.*, X is required to be normal, and one works in the category of normal models of X. A b-divisor on X is an element

$$\mathbf{D} = (\mathbf{D}_Y)_Y \in \varprojlim_Y \operatorname{Div}(Y) \,,$$

where $\operatorname{Div}(Y)$ is the group of Weil divisors on a normal model Y of X, and the projective limit is relative to push-forwards $\phi_*\colon \operatorname{Div} Y_1 \to \operatorname{Div} Y_2$ via morphisms $\phi\colon Y_1 \to Y_2$, if Y_1 dominates Y_2 via ϕ. A b-divisor $\mathbf{D}$ on X is b-Cartier if there is a normal model Y of X and a Cartier divisor D on Y such that $\mathbf{D}_{Y_1} = \phi^* D$ for all normal models Y_1 of Y with X-morphisms $\phi\colon Y_1 \to Y$.

To see that this definition is equivalent to Definition 6.1c, we first note that restricting models in Definition 6.1 to normal models does not change the definition. Then, since the normalization of X is a final object in the category of normal models of X, we may assume that X is normal. It is then straightforward to see that this definition agrees with the definition in *op. cit.*

Lemma 6.3. *Let X be a variety, let $\mathbf{D}$ be a b-Cartier b-divisor on X, and let (Y, D) be a pair that represents $\mathbf{D}$. Assume that Y is normal. Then $\mathbf{D}$ is effective if and only if D is effective.*

Proof. The reverse implication is immediate from the definitions.

To prove the forward implication, assume that $\mathbf{D}$ is effective. By definition, there is a pair (Y', D') representing $\mathbf{D}$ such that D' is effective. By pulling back to a possibly larger model, we may assume that Y' dominates Y, say by $f\colon Y' \to Y$, and that Y' is normal. Then $D = f_*D'$ (here f_* refers to Weil divisors; note that $f_*f^*D = D$). In particular, by Remark 3.3, D is effective. □

The following definition generalizes the definition of Weil function to b-Cartier b-divisors. This definition comes from [Voj96, § 7]. In *loc. cit.* they were called *generalized Weil functions*, but it is now apparent that it is more natural to call them *b-Weil functions*.

Definition 6.4. *Let X be a complete variety over a number field k. Then a **b-Weil function** on X is an equivalence class of pairs (U, λ), where U is a nonempty Zariski-open subset of X and $\lambda\colon U(M_k) \to \mathbb{R}$ is a function such that there exist a model $\phi\colon Y \to X$ of X and a Cartier divisor D on Y such that $\lambda \circ \phi$ extends to a Weil function for D. Pairs (U, λ) and (U', λ') are **equivalent** if $\lambda = \lambda'$ on $(U \cap U')(M_k)$. Local b-Weil functions on X are defined similarly.*

It is clear that every Weil function on a variety X over k is also a b-Weil function on X, and that b-Weil functions on X form an abelian group under addition. Also, if $\phi\colon X \dashrightarrow Y$ is a dominant rational map and if λ is a b-Weil function on Y, then $\phi^*\lambda$ (defined in the obvious way) is a b-Weil function on X. The same facts are true for local b-Weil functions at a given place v.

Definition 6.5. *Let X be a complete variety over a number field k, let λ be a b-Weil function on X, and let $\mathbf{D}$ be a b-Cartier b-divisor on X. We say that λ is a **b-Weil function for** $\mathbf{D}$ if $\mathbf{D}$ is represented by a pair (Y, D) as in Definition 6.1, such that if $\phi\colon Y \to X$ is the structural morphism of Y, then $\lambda \circ \phi$ extends to a Weil function for D on Y.*

Proposition 6.6. *Let X be a complete variety over a number field k.*

(a). *For $i = 1, 2$ let $\mathbf{D}_i$ be a b-Cartier b-divisor on X and let λ_i be a b-Weil function for $\mathbf{D}_i$. Then $-\lambda_1$ and $\lambda_1 + \lambda_2$ are b-Weil functions for $-\mathbf{D}_1$ and $\mathbf{D}_1 + \mathbf{D}_2$, respectively.*

(b). *Let $\mathbf{D}$ be a b-Cartier b-divisor and let λ be a b-Weil function on X for $\mathbf{D}$. Then λ is M_k-bounded from below if and only if $\mathbf{D}$ is effective, and λ is M_k-bounded if and only if $\mathbf{D} = 0$.*

(c). *Let λ be a b-Weil function on X. Then there is a unique b-Cartier b-divisor $\mathbf{D}$ such that λ is a b-Weil function for $\mathbf{D}$.*

(d). *Let $\mathbf{D}$ be a b-Cartier b-divisor on X. Then there is a b-Weil function λ for $\mathbf{D}$.*

(e). *The map $\lambda \mapsto \mathbf{D}$ in part (c) gives a group isomorphism from the group of b-Weil functions on X, modulo addition of M_k-bounded functions, to the group of b-Cartier b-divisors on X.*

Analogous statements hold for local b-Weil functions at a fixed place v of k.

Proof. (a). For each i let $\phi_i\colon Y_i \to X$ be a model of X and let D_i be a Cartier divisor on Y_i such that $\phi_i \circ \lambda_i$ extends to a Weil function on Y_i for D_i, and such that (Y_i, D_i) represents $\mathbf{D}_i$. Then the first assertion is immediate, since $-\phi_1 \circ \lambda_1$ extends to a Weil function for $-D_1$ on Y_1. For the second assertion, we may replace Y_1 and Y_2 with a model Y for X that dominates both of them, and pull back D_1 and D_2 to Y. Then the assertion follows from additivity of Weil functions on Y.

(b). Let $\phi\colon Y \to X$ be a model of X and let D be a Cartier divisor on Y such that $\phi \circ \lambda$ extends to a Weil function for D on Y, and such that (Y, D) represents $\mathbf{D}$. By replacing Y with its normalization, we may assume that Y is normal. Then λ is M_k-bounded from below if and only if D is effective, by Proposition 3.4. If D is effective, then so is $\mathbf{D}$. Conversely, if $\mathbf{D}$ is effective, then it is represented by a pair (Y', D') with D' effective. Let Y'' be a normal model of X that dominates both Y and Y', and let $\psi\colon Y'' \to Y$ and $\psi'\colon Y'' \to Y'$ be the implied morphisms. Then $D = \psi_*(\psi')^* D'$ is effective, so λ is M_k-bounded from below.

The second assertion follows formally by applying the first assertion also to $-\lambda$ and $-\mathbf{D}$.

(c). Let λ be a b-Weil function on X. By Definition 6.4 there exist a model $\phi\colon Y \to X$ for X and a Cartier divisor D on Y such that $\lambda \circ \phi$ extends to a Weil function for D on Y. Then λ is a b-Weil function for the b-Cartier b-divisor $\mathbf{D}$ represented by the pair (Y, D). To show uniqueness, suppose that λ is a b-Weil function for b-Cartier b-divisors $\mathbf{D}_1$ and $\mathbf{D}_2$. Then $\lambda - \lambda = 0$ is a b-Weil function for $\mathbf{D}_1 - \mathbf{D}_2$. This divisor must be zero, by part (b) applied to $\pm(\mathbf{D}_1 - \mathbf{D}_2)$.

(d). Let $\mathbf{D}$ be a b-Cartier b-divisor, and let (Y, D) be a pair representing it. By Chow's lemma, we may assume that Y is projective. By Lang [Lan83, Ch. 10, Thm. 3.5], there is a Weil function for D on Y. This defines a b-Weil function for $\mathbf{D}$.

(e). Part (c) determines a well-defined function from the group of b-Weil functions on X to the group of b-Cartier b-divisors on X. Part (a) implies that it is a group homomorphism, part (b) implies that its kernel is the subgroup of M_k-bounded b-Weil functions, and part (d) implies that it is surjective.

The proofs of corresponding statements for local b-Weil functions are left to the reader. □

The main reason for defining b-Weil functions in [Voj96] was the fact that the (pointwise) maximum of two Weil functions may not be a Weil function, but the maximum of two b-Weil functions is another b-Weil function. The main result of this section shows that the group of b-Cartier b-divisors on a variety also has a least upper bound, relative to the cone of effective b-Cartier b-divisors, and that this lub corresponds to the maximum of b-Weil functions.

We start with a lemma on the underlying geometry of a least upper bound of b-Cartier b-divisors. It will not be used until later (Proposition 6.12), but it is stated here because it provides valuable intuition.

Lemma 6.7. *Let X be a variety over a field, and let $\mathbf{D}$ and $\mathbf{D}_1, \dots, \mathbf{D}_n$ be b-Cartier b-divisors on X. Let $\phi\colon Y \to X$ be a normal model of X such that $\mathbf{D}$ and $\mathbf{D}_1, \dots, \mathbf{D}_\ell$ are represented by Cartier divisors D and $D_1, \dots, D_\ell$ on Y, respectively. Then $\mathbf{D}$ is a least upper bound of $\mathbf{D}_1, \dots, \mathbf{D}_\ell$ if and only if $D - D_i$ is effective for all i and*

$$\bigcap_{i=1}^{\ell} \operatorname{Supp}(D - D_i) = \emptyset\,.$$

Proof. By Lemma 6.3, $\mathbf{D}$ is an upper bound of $\mathbf{D}_1, \dots, \mathbf{D}_\ell$ if and only if $D - D_i$ is effective for all i.

Let $Z = \bigcap \operatorname{Supp}(D - D_i)$ and suppose that $Z \neq \emptyset$. Let $f\colon Y' \to Y$ be the blowing-up of Y along Z, and let E be the exceptional divisor. Then E is a nonzero effective Cartier divisor, and $f^*(D - D_i) - E$ is effective for all i. This shows that $(Y', f^*D - E)$ represents another upper bound of $\mathbf{D}_1, \dots, \mathbf{D}_\ell$, and therefore $\mathbf{D}$ is not a *least* upper bound. Thus $Z = \emptyset$. □

This next lemma shows that the above situation is not uncommon. It is taken from the proof of [Voj96, Prop. 7.3].

Lemma 6.8. *Let D be a Cartier divisor on a variety Y over a field k. Then there are a proper model $\phi\colon Z \to Y$ and effective Cartier divisors D' and D'' on Z such that $\phi^*D = D' - D''$, and such that the supports of D' and D'' are disjoint.*

Proof. If U is an open subset of Y on which D is equal to a principal divisor (f), then define Z_U to be the closure of the graph of the rational function $U \dashrightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$ given by f, and let D' and D'' be the pull-backs of the divisors $[0]$ and $[\infty]$ on $\mathbb{P}^1$, respectively. This construction is compatible with restricting

to an open subset U, and multiplying f by an element of $\mathscr{O}_U^*$ induces an automorphism of Z_U that fixes D' and D''. Therefore the schemes Z_U and divisors D' and D'' on Z_U glue together to give a scheme Z, proper over Y, and Cartier divisors D' and D'' on Z, that satisfy the conditions of the lemma. □

For the next step, we recall that a **lattice** is a partially ordered set in which every pair of elements a, b has a least upper bound and a greatest lower bound. These are called the **join** and **meet**, respectively, and are denoted $a \vee b$ and $a \wedge b$, respectively.

The following definition comes from Steinberg [Ste10, Ch. 2].

Definition 6.9. *A **lattice-ordered group** is a group G, together with a partial ordering on G that respects the group operation (i.e., $x \le y \iff xz \le yz \iff zx \le zy$ for all $x, y, z \in G$), such that the partial ordering forms a lattice.*

In this paper, all lattice-ordered groups are abelian, and are written additively.

Proposition 6.10. *Let X be a complete variety over a field k.*

(a). *Let the set of b-Cartier b-divisors on X be partially ordered by the relation $\mathbf{D}_1 \le \mathbf{D}_2$ if $D_2 - D_1$ is effective. Then the group of b-Cartier b-divisors on X is a lattice-ordered group.*

(b). *Assume that k is a number field. Let G be the group of b-Weil functions on X, modulo the set of M_k-bounded functions. Let G be partially ordered by the condition that $\lambda_1 \le \lambda_2$ if $\lambda_2 - \lambda_1$ is M_k-bounded from below. Then G is isomorphic to the partially ordered group of b-Cartier b-divisors on X under the isomorphism of Proposition 6.6. In particular, it is a lattice-ordered group.*

(c). *Assume that k is a number field, and let G be the group of part (b). Let λ_1 and λ_2 be b-Weil functions for b-Cartier b-divisors $\mathbf{D}_1$ and $\mathbf{D}_2$, respectively, on X. Then the function $\max\{\lambda_1, \lambda_2\}$ is a b-Weil function for the b-Cartier b-divisor $\mathbf{D}_1 \vee \mathbf{D}_2$, and its image in G is the join of the images of λ_1 and λ_2 in G.*

Proof. (a). That the group is a partially ordered group is clear from the definition of the ordering.

To check that it is a lattice, by the group property it suffices to check that for any b-Cartier b-Weil divisor $\mathbf{D}$ on X, the pair $\mathbf{D}, \mathbf{0}$ has a least upper bound. To do this, let (Y, D) be a representative for $\mathbf{D}$. By replacing Y with the model constructed in Lemma 6.8, we may assume that $D = D' - D''$, where D' and D'' are effective Cartier divisors with disjoint supports. We

may also assume that Y is normal. Then (Y, D') represents a least upper bound for the pair $\mathbf{D}, \mathbf{0}$. Indeed, this is true by Lemma 6.7, because the divisors $D' - D = D''$ and $D' - 0$ are effective divisors with disjoint supports.

(b). Part (b) of Proposition 6.6 implies that the group isomorphism preserves the ordering, so G is a lattice-ordered group.

(c). Again, we may assume that $\lambda_2 = 0$. Then $\mathbf{D}_2 = \mathbf{0}$. As in the proof of (a), we may let (Y, D) be a representative for $\mathbf{D}_1$, and may assume that Y is normal and that $D = D' - D''$, where D' and D'' are effective with disjoint supports. Then (Y, D') represents $\mathbf{D}_1 \vee \mathbf{0}$.

Let $\phi\colon Y \to X$ be the structural morphism of Y. Then $\phi^*\lambda_1$ is a Weil function for D. By Proposition 3.6, $\max\{\phi^*\lambda_1, 0\}$ is a Weil function for D', and therefore $\max\{\lambda_1, 0\}$ is a b-Weil function for the b-Cartier b-divisor represented by the pair (Y, D'). Thus, it is a b-Weil function for $\mathbf{D}_1 \vee \mathbf{0}$. This proves the first assertion. The other assertion then follows from (b). □

We now can give some equivalent formulations of Definition 5.3 using b-divisors and b-Weil functions. We start with a definition that focuses on the part of the definition of $\mathrm{Nev}_{\mathrm{bir}}$ that varies.

Definition 6.11. *Let X be a normal complete variety, let D be an effective Cartier divisor on X, let $\mathscr{L}$ be a line sheaf on X, let V be a linear subspace of $H^0(X, \mathscr{L})$ with $\dim V > 1$, and let $\mu > 0$ be a rational number. We say that D has μ-**b-growth with respect to** V **and** $\mathscr{L}$ if there is a model $\phi\colon Y \to X$ of X such that for all $Q \in Y$ there is a basis $\mathcal{B}$ of V such that*

$$\phi^*(\mathcal{B}) \geq \mu\phi^* D \tag{41}$$

*in a Zariski-open neighborhood U of Q, relative to the cone of effective $\mathbb{Q}$-divisors on U. Also, we say that D has μ-**b-growth with respect to** V if it satisfies the above condition with $\mathscr{L} = \mathscr{O}(D)$.*

Then Definition 5.3 basically says that $\mathrm{Nev}_{\mathrm{bir}}(D)$ is the infimum of $(\dim V)/\mu$ over all triples (N, V, μ) such that ND has μ-b-growth with respect to V and $\mathscr{L}^D$. (The corresponding condition for Definition 5.2 is called μ-growth; see [Ru15b]. The proof of Lemma 5.5 then amounts to saying that if D has μ-growth with respect to V, then it also has μ-b-growth with respect to V.)

The following proposition completes Proposition 5.7 (and adds more equivalent conditions).

Proposition 6.12. *Let X be a normal complete variety, let D be an effective Cartier divisor on X, let $\mathscr{L}$ be a line sheaf on X, let V be a linear subspace of $H^0(X, \mathscr{L})$ with $\dim V > 1$, and let $\mu > 0$ be a rational number. Then the following are equivalent.*

(i) *D has μ-b-growth with respect to V and $\mathscr{L}$.*

(ii) *Let n be a positive integer such that $n\mu \in \mathbb{Z}$. Then there are bases $\mathcal{B}_1, \dots, \mathcal{B}_\ell$ of V such that*

$$n \bigvee_{i=1}^{\ell} (\mathcal{B}_i) \geq n\mu D \tag{42}$$

relative to the cone of effective b-Cartier b-divisors.

(iii) *There are bases $\mathcal{B}_1, \dots, \mathcal{B}_\ell$ of V; Weil functions $\lambda_{\mathcal{B}_1}, \dots, \lambda_{\mathcal{B}_\ell}$ for the divisors $(\mathcal{B}_1), \dots, (\mathcal{B}_\ell)$, respectively; a Weil function λ_D for D; and an M_k-constant c such that*

$$\max_{1\leq i\leq \ell} \lambda_{\mathcal{B}_i} \geq \mu\lambda_D - c \tag{43}$$

(as functions $X(M_k) \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$).

(iv) *For each place $v \in M_k$ there are finitely many bases $\mathcal{B}_1, \dots, \mathcal{B}_\ell$ of V; local Weil functions $\lambda_{\mathcal{B}_1,v}, \dots, \lambda_{\mathcal{B}_\ell,v}$ for the divisors $(\mathcal{B}_1), \dots, (\mathcal{B}_\ell)$, respectively, at v; a local Weil function $\lambda_{D,v}$ for D at v; and a constant c such that*

$$\max_{1\leq i\leq \ell} \lambda_{\mathcal{B}_i,v} \geq \mu\lambda_{D,v} - c \tag{44}$$

(as functions $X(\overline{k}_v) \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$).

(v) *The condition of (iv) holds for at least one place v.*

Proof. Conditions (ii) and (iii) are equivalent by Proposition 6.10. Conditions (iii)–(v) are equivalent by Proposition 3.4. The implication (i) $\Longrightarrow$ (iii) is Proposition 5.7. Finally, (ii) $\Longrightarrow$ (i) follows from Lemma 6.13 (below), with $D_i = (\mathcal{B}_i)$ for all i. □

Lemma 6.13. *Let X be a normal complete variety, let $\mu > 0$ be a rational number, and let n be a positive integer such that $n\mu \in \mathbb{Z}$. Let D and $D_1, \dots, D_\ell$ be Cartier divisors on X. Assume that*

$$n \bigvee_{i=1}^{\ell} D_i \geq n\mu D \tag{45}$$

relative to the cone of effective b-Cartier b-divisors. Then there is a model $\phi\colon Y \to X$ of X such that for all $Q \in Y$ there is an index i such that $\phi^*D_i \geq \mu\phi^*D$ in a Zariski-open neighborhood U of Q, relative to the cone of effective $\mathbb{Q}$-divisors on U.

Proof. Assume that (45) is true. Let $\mathbf{E} = \bigvee D_i$, and let $\phi\colon Y \to X$ be a normal model of X such that $\mathbf{E}$ is represented by a Cartier divisor E on Y. By Lemma 6.7, $E - \phi^*D_i$ is effective for all i, and $\bigcap \operatorname{Supp}(E - \phi^*D_i) = \emptyset$. Therefore, for any given $Q \in Y$ there is an index i such that $Q \notin \operatorname{Supp}(E -$

$\phi^* D_i$). Fix such an i, and let $U_i = Y \setminus \operatorname{Supp}(E - \phi^* D_i)$. Then $Q \in U_i$. Moreover, by (45),

$$n\phi^* D_i\big|_{U_i} = nE\big|_{U_i} \geq n\mu\phi^* D\big|_{U_i}$$

relative to the cone of effective divisors on U_i. Therefore $\phi^* D_i \geq \mu\phi^* D$ on U_i relative to the cone of effective $\mathbb{Q}$-divisors on U_i, as was to be shown. □

Remark 6.14. In light of Proposition 5.6, one may regard (39) or (42) as being conditions that are *local on the Zariski–Riemann space*, as opposed to (38), which is local in the Zariski topology. (The Zariski–Riemann space of a complete variety X is the inverse limit of all models of X [ZS60, Ch. VI, § 17].)

Proposition 6.12 leads to the following Corollary which is the Definition 1.2 of $\operatorname{Nev}_{\mathrm{bir}}(\mathscr{L}, D)$:

Corollary 6.15. *Let X be a normal complete variety, let D be an effective Cartier divisor on X, and let $\mathscr{L}$ be a line sheaf on X. Then*

$$\operatorname{Nev}_{\mathrm{bir}}(\mathscr{L}, D) = \inf_{N,V,\mu} \frac{\dim V}{\mu}\,,$$

where the infimum passes over all triples (N, V, μ) such that $N \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, V is a linear subspace of $H^0(X, \mathscr{L}^N)$ with $\dim V > 1$, and $\mu \in \mathbb{Q}_{>0}$, with the following property. There are finitely many bases $\mathcal{B}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{B}_\ell$ of V; Weil functions $\lambda_{\mathcal{B}_1}, \ldots, \lambda_{\mathcal{B}_\ell}$ for the divisors $(\mathcal{B}_1), \ldots, (\mathcal{B}_\ell)$, respectively; a Weil function λ_D for D; and an M_k-constant c such that

$$\max_{1 \leq i \leq \ell} \lambda_{\mathcal{B}_i} \geq \mu N \lambda_D - c \tag{46}$$

(as functions $X(M_k) \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$). (Here we use the same convention as in Definition 5.3 when there are no triples (N, V, μ) that satisfy the condition.)

Similar corollaries are true for conditions (ii), (iv), and (v) of Proposition 6.12.

The following proposition can be used in the proof of the General Theorem in Section 4.

Proposition 6.16. *Let X be a variety over a number field or over $\mathbf{C}$, let $\mathscr{L}$ be a line sheaf on X, and let $E_1, \ldots, E_m$ be effective Cartier divisors on X. Let s be a nonzero global section of $\mathscr{L}$ lying in the (coherent) subsheaf of $\mathscr{L}$ generated by $\mathscr{L}(-E_j)$ $(j = 1, \ldots, m)$. Let λ_s be a Weil function for the divisor (s), and for each j let λ_{E_j} be a Weil function for E_j. Then there is an M_k-constant c such that*

$$\lambda_s \geq \min_j \lambda_{E_j} + c\,. \tag{47}$$

Proof. By Proposition 6.10, (47) is equivalent to the assertion that the divisor

$$(s) - \bigwedge_{j=1}^{m} E_j$$

is effective.

Let $\mathbf{E} = \bigwedge E_j$, and let $\phi\colon Y \to X$ be a model of X on which $\mathbf{E}$ is represented by a Cartier divisor E. Since $\phi^*E_j - E$ is effective for all j, the sheaf $\phi^*\mathscr{L}(-E)$ contains the sheaves $\phi^*(\mathscr{L}(-E_j))$ for all j, and therefore ϕ^*s is a global section of $\phi^*\mathscr{L}(-E)$.

This implies that the divisor $\phi^*(s)-E$ is effective, as was to be shown. □

7. The Proof of Theorems 1.4 and 1.5 for $\mathrm{Nev}_{\mathrm{bir}}(\mathscr{L}, D)$

In this section, we prove Theorems 1.4 and 1.5, which are the variations of Theorems A and B with $\mathrm{Nev}(D)$ replaced by $\mathrm{Nev}_{\mathrm{bir}}(\mathscr{L}, D)$. We will only prove Theorem 1.5 (the number field case), since the proof of Theorem 1.4 is very similar. However, for this theorem we will give both a complete proof, based on Proposition 5.6 and Theorem B with $\mathrm{Nev}(\mathscr{L}, D)$ (note that Theorem B still holds, with the same proof, if $\mathrm{Nev}(D)$ is replaced by $\mathrm{Nev}(\mathscr{L}, D)$), and a sketch of how to prove the theorem directly, based on the proof of Theorem B in [Ru15b].

Proof of Theorem 1.5. Let k, S, X, and D be as in the statement of the theorem, and let $\epsilon > 0$ be given. By Proposition 5.6b, there is a model $\phi\colon Y \to X$ of X such that

$$\mathrm{Nev}(\phi^*\mathscr{L}, \phi^*D) < \mathrm{Nev}_{\mathrm{bir}}(\mathscr{L}, D) + \epsilon\ . \tag{48}$$

Let $Z_0 \subseteq Y$ be the ramification locus of ϕ.

By Theorem B with $\mathrm{Nev}(\mathscr{L}, D)$, there is a proper Zariski-closed subset Z_1 of Y such that the inequality

$$m_S(y, \phi^*D) \le (\mathrm{Nev}(\phi^*\mathscr{L}, \phi^*D) + \epsilon)\, h_{\phi^*\mathscr{L}}(y) \tag{49}$$

holds for all $y \in Y(k)$ outside of Z_1.

By functoriality of proximity functions, (49), (48), and functoriality of heights, we then have

$$\begin{aligned} m_S(x, D) &= m_S(\phi^{-1}(x), \phi^*D) + O(1) \\ &\le (\mathrm{Nev}(\phi^*\mathscr{L}, \phi^*D) + \epsilon)\, h_{\phi^*\mathscr{L}}(\phi^{-1}(x)) + O(1) \\ &\le (\mathrm{Nev}_{\mathrm{bir}}(\mathscr{L}, D) + 2\epsilon)\, h_{\phi^*\mathscr{L}}(\phi^{-1}(x)) + O(1) \\ &= (\mathrm{Nev}_{\mathrm{bir}}(\mathscr{L}, D) + 2\epsilon)\, h_{\mathscr{L}}(x) + O(1) \end{aligned}$$

for all $x \in X(k)$ outside of $Z := \phi(Z_0 \cup Z_1)$. (Note that this set is closed since ϕ is proper, and that ϕ induces an isomorphism over $X \setminus Z$ since ϕ is unramified over that set.) □

We now indicate how Theorem 1.5 can be proved using the methods of [Ru15b, Sect. 2].

First, we note that it will suffice to prove the following proposition. This is a variant of [Ru15b, Prop. 2.1].

Proposition 7.1. *Let k and S be as in the statement of Theorem 1.5. Let X be a normal complete variety over k. Let D be an effective Cartier divisor and $\mathscr{L}$ be a line sheaf on X with $h^0(\mathscr{L}^N) \geq 1$ for N big enough. Let (N, V, μ) be a triple such that ND has μ-b-growth with respect to V and $\mathscr{L}^N$.*

Then, for each $\epsilon > 0$, there is a proper Zariski-closed subset Z of X such that the inequality

$$m_S(x, D) \leq \left(\frac{\dim V}{\mu} + \epsilon \right) h_{\mathscr{L}}(x)$$

holds for all $x \in X(k)$ outside of Z.

The fact that this proposition implies Theorem 1.5 follows using almost exactly the same argument as appears in the end of Sect. 2 of [Ru15b] (involving pulling the proximity and height functions back to the normalization of X). It will not be repeated here.

Proof of Proposition 7.1. Assume that ND has μ-b-growth with respect to $V \subseteq H^0(X, \mathscr{L}^N)$ and $\mathscr{L}$.

By Corollary 6.15, there are bases $\mathcal{B}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{B}_\ell$ of V; Weil functions $\lambda_{\mathcal{B}_1}, \ldots, \lambda_{\mathcal{B}_\ell}$ for the divisors $(\mathcal{B}_1), \ldots, (\mathcal{B}_\ell)$, respectively; a Weil function λ_D for D; and an M_k-constant c such that

$$\max_{1 \leq i \leq \ell} \lambda_{\mathcal{B}_i} \geq \mu N \lambda_D - c \tag{50}$$

(as functions $X(M_k) \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$).

Write

$$\bigcup_{i=1}^{\ell} \mathcal{B}_i = \{s_1, \ldots, s_q\} .$$

and for each $j = 1, \ldots, q$ choose a Weil function λ_{s_j} for the divisor (s_j).

For each $i = 1, \dots, \ell$, let $J_i \subseteq \{1, \dots, q\}$ be the subset such that $\mathcal{B}_i = \{s_j : j \in J_i\}$. Then, by (50), for each $v \in S$ there are constants c_v and c'_v such that

$$\begin{aligned} \mu N \lambda_{D,v} &\le \max_{1 \le i \le \ell} \lambda_{\mathcal{B}_i, v} + c'_v \\ &\le \max_{1 \le i \le \ell} \sum_{j \in J_i} \lambda_{s_j, v} + c_v \, . \end{aligned} \tag{51}$$

By Schmidt's Subspace Theorem in the form of Theorem 2.7, there is a proper Zariski-closed subset Z of X such that the inequality

$$\sum_{v \in S} \max_{J} \sum_{j \in J} \lambda_{s_j, v}(x) \le (\dim V + \epsilon) h_{\mathscr{L}^N}(x) \tag{52}$$

holds for all $x \in X(k)$ outside of Z; here the maximum is taken over all subsets J of $\{1, \dots, q\}$ for which the sections s_j, $j \in J$, are linearly independent.

Combining (51) and (52) gives

$$\begin{aligned} \mu N m_S(D, x) &= \mu N \sum_{v \in S} \lambda_{D,v}(x) + O(1) \\ &\le \sum_{v \in S} \max_{1 \le i \le \ell} \sum_{j \in J_i} \lambda_{s_j, v}(x) + O(1) \\ &\le \sum_{v \in S} \max_{J} \sum_{j \in J} \lambda_{s_j, v}(x) + O(1) \\ &\le (\dim V + \epsilon) h_{\mathscr{L}^N}(x) + O(1) \\ &= N (\dim V + \epsilon) h_{\mathscr{L}}(x) + O(1) \end{aligned}$$

for all $x \in X(k)$ outside of Z. Here we used the fact that all of the J_i occur among the J in (52). □

8. An Example of Faltings: Geometry

In his 1999 contribution to the *Baker's Garden* volume, Faltings [Fal02] gave a class of examples of irreducible divisors D on $\mathbb{P}^2$ for which $\mathbb{P}^2 \setminus D$ has only finitely many integral points over any number ring, and over any localization of such a ring away from finitely many places.

This paper is notable for two reasons. First, the divisor D is irreducible. Prior to the paper, the only divisors D on $\mathbb{P}^2$ for which such statements were know were divisors with at least four irreducible components. The second reason is that the paper gives examples of varieties for which finiteness of integral points is known, yet which cannot be embedded into semiabelian varieties. Prior to the paper, the only varieties for which such finiteness

statements were known, and which could not be embedded into semiabelian varieties, were moduli spaces of abelian varieties.

These examples were further explored by Zannier [Zan05] using methods of Zannier and Corvaja, although Zannier used a different family of examples. This family has substantial overlap with the examples of Faltings but does not contain all of his examples. After that, Levin [Lev09, § 13] derived a generalization, using his method of *large divisors,* that encompasses the examples of both Faltings and Zannier.

Looking at Faltings' examples from the point of view of the Nevanlinna constant was what led to the formulation of $\mathrm{Nev}_{\mathrm{bir}}$. This came about because the left-hand sides of (53) and (54) involved maxima of Weil functions.

We will split the main result of Faltings' paper into two theorems. The first of the two guarantees that examples with certain properties exist, and the second says that in each such example, the divisor D on $\mathbb{P}^2$ has the property that $\mathbb{P}^2\backslash D$ has only finitely many integral points over any ring $\mathscr{O}_{k,S}$, where $\mathscr{O}_{k,S}$ is the localization $\mathscr{O}_{k,S}$ of the ring of integers of a sufficiently large number field k away from a finite set of places S. We prove only the second theorem here, since that is the part that involves Nevanlinna constants.

This section will cover the geometry of the examples, and the part of the proof of Theorem 8.2 that is specific to the geometry, and the next section will finish the proof of the theorem, using methods applicable in more general settings.

Theorem 8.1 (Faltings)**.** *Let k be a field of characteristic zero, and let X be a smooth geometrically irreducible algebraic surface over k. Then, for all sufficiently positive line sheaves $\mathscr{L}$ on X, there exists a morphism $f\colon X \to \mathbb{P}^2$ that satisfies the following conditions.*

(i) *$f^*\mathscr{O}(1) \cong \mathscr{L}$.*
(ii) *The ramification locus Z of f is smooth and irreducible, and the ramification index is 2.*
(iii) *The restriction of f to Z is birational onto its image $D \subseteq \mathbb{P}^2$.*
(iv) *D is nonsingular except for cusps and simple double points.*
(v) *Let $Y \to X \to \mathbb{P}^2$ denote the Galois closure of $X \to \mathbb{P}^2$ (i.e., the normalization of X in the Galois closure of $K(X)$ over $K(\mathbb{P}^2)$). Also let $n = \deg f$. Then Y is smooth and its Galois group over $\mathbb{P}^2$ is the full symmetric group $\mathscr{S}_n$.*
(vi) *The ramification locus of Y over $\mathbb{P}^2$ is the sum of distinct conjugate effective divisors Z_{ij}, $1 \le i < j \le n$. They have smooth supports, and are disjoint with the following two exceptions. Points of Y lying over double points of D are fixed points of a subgroup $\mathscr{S}_2 \times \mathscr{S}_2$ of*

$\mathscr{S}_n$, and they lie on $Z_{ij} \cap Z_{\ell m}$ with distinct indices i, j, ℓ, m. Points of Y lying over cusps of D are fixed points of a subgroup $\mathscr{S}_3$ of $\mathscr{S}_n$, and lie on $Z_{ij} \cap Z_{i\ell} \cap Z_{j\ell}$.

For a proof of this theorem, and also an explicit description of the "sufficiently positive" condition on $\mathscr{L}$, see Faltings' paper [Fal02].

For convenience, write $Z_{ij} = Z_{ji}$ when $i, j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ and $i > j$. Let

$$A_i = \sum_{j \neq i} Z_{ij} \qquad \text{and} \qquad M = \sum A_i = \sum_{i \neq j} Z_{ij} \, .$$

Let L be the divisor class of $\mathscr{L}$ on X, and let it also denote the pull-back of this divisor class to Y. In addition, let $d = \deg D$. We then have

$$2 \sum_{i<j} Z_{ij} = \sum A_i = M \sim dL \, .$$

The other part of Faltings' result is the following.

Theorem 8.2. *Let k be a number field and let S be a finite set of places of k. Let Y, n, $\{Z_{ij}\}_{i<j}$, $\{A_i\}_i$, and M be as in Theorem 8.1 and the discussion following it. Also let α be a rational number such that $M - \alpha A_i$ is an ample $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor for all i. Then:*

(a). *if $\alpha > 6$ then no set of $\mathscr{O}_{k,S}$-integral points on $Y \setminus \bigcup Z_{ij}$ is Zariski-dense, and*
(b). *if $\alpha > 8$ then every set of $\mathscr{O}_{k,S}$-integral points on $Y \setminus \bigcup Z_{ij}$ is finite.*

Since $Y \setminus \bigcup Z_{ij}$ is an étale cover of $\mathbb{P}^2 \setminus D$, the above conclusions also hold for $\mathbb{P}^2 \setminus D$ (see Serre [Ser89, § 4.2] or the second author [Voj87, § 5.1]).

The first part of the proof of this theorem is the following proposition, which contains all of the geometry specific to the situation of Theorem 8.1.

Proposition 8.3. *Let k be a number field, and let Y, n, $\{Z_{ij}\}_{i<j}$, $\{A_i\}_i$, M, and α be as in Theorem 8.2. Assume that $n \geq 4$. Fix Weil functions λ_{ij} for each Z_{ij}. Let β be an integer such that $\beta\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}$ and such that βM and all $\beta(M - \alpha A_i)$ are very ample. Fix an embedding $Y \hookrightarrow \mathbb{P}^N_k$ associated to a complete linear system of βM, and regard Y as a subvariety of $\mathbb{P}^N_k$ via this embedding. Then*

(a). *There are a finite list $H_1, \dots, H_q$ of hyperplanes in $\mathbb{P}^N_k$, with associated Weil functions λ_{H_j} for all j, and constants c_v for all $v \in M_k$, with the following property. Let $\mathscr{J}$ be the collection*

of all 3-element subsets $J = \{j_0, j_1, j_2\}$ of $\{1, \dots, q\}$ for which $Y \cap H_{j_0} \cap H_{j_1} \cap H_{j_2} = \emptyset$. Then $\mathscr{J} \neq \emptyset$, and the inequality

$$\max_{J \in \mathscr{J}} \sum_{j \in J} \lambda_{H_j}(y) \geq \beta\alpha \sum_{i<j} \lambda_{ij}(y) - c_v \tag{53}$$

holds for all $v \in M_k$ and all $y \in Y(\overline{k}_v)$ not lying on the support of any Z_{ij} or on any of the H_j.

(b). *Let C be an integral curve in Y, not contained in the support of any Z_{ij}. Then there are a finite list $H_1, \dots, H_q$ of hyperplanes, with associated Weil functions as before, and constants c_v for all $v \in M_k$, with the following property. Let $\mathscr{J}$ be the collection of all 2-element subsets $J = \{j_0, j_1\}$ of $\{1, \dots, q\}$ for which $C \cap H_{j_0} \cap H_{j_1} = \emptyset$. Then $\mathscr{J} \neq \emptyset$, and the inequality*

$$\max_{J \in \mathscr{J}} \sum_{j \in J} \lambda_{H_j}(y) \geq \frac{\beta\alpha}{2} \sum_{i<j} \lambda_{ij}(y) - c_v \tag{54}$$

holds for all $v \in M_k$ and for all but finitely many $y \in C(\overline{k}_v)$.

The proof of this proposition, in turn, relies mainly on two lemmas. These lemmas replace Faltings' computations of ideals associated to indices.

Lemma 8.4. *Let i, j, ℓ, m be distinct indices. Then:*

(a). *there exist hyperplanes H_0, H_1, and H_2 in $\mathbb{P}^N_k$, such that*

$$Y \cap H_0 \cap H_1 \cap H_2 = \emptyset$$

and

$$(H_0 + H_1 + H_2)\big|_Y - \beta\alpha(Z_{ij} + Z_{\ell m}) \tag{55}$$

is an effective Cartier divisor on Y; and

(b). *given any integral curve $C \subseteq Y$ not contained in any of the Z_{ab}, there are hyperplanes H_0 and H_1 in $\mathbb{P}^N_k$, such that $C \cap H_0 \cap H_1 = \emptyset$ and*

$$(H_0 + H_1)\big|_C - Z_{ij}\big|_C \tag{56}$$

is an effective Cartier divisor on C.

Proof. Let σ_i and σ_j be the canonical sections of $\mathscr{O}(A_i)$ and $\mathscr{O}(A_j)$, respectively. Then the linear system

$$\sigma_i^{\beta\alpha} \cdot \Gamma(Y, \beta(M - \alpha A_i)) + \sigma_j^{\beta\alpha} \cdot \Gamma(Y, \beta(M - \alpha A_j))$$

has base locus $\operatorname{Supp} A_i \cap \operatorname{Supp} A_j$, since the first summand has base locus $\operatorname{Supp} A_i$ and the second has base locus $\operatorname{Supp} A_j$. This intersection consists of the union of Z_{ij} and finitely many closed points. Choose an element of this linear system, sufficiently generic so that it does not vanish identically on

any irreducible component of $Z_{\ell m}$, and let H_0 be the associated hyperplane in $\mathbb{P}^N_k$. Then $H_0\big|_Y - \beta\alpha Z_{ij}$ is an effective divisor.

Similarly let σ_ℓ and σ_m be the canonical sections of $\mathscr{O}(A_\ell)$ and $\mathscr{O}(A_m)$, and let H_1 be the hyperplane associated to an element of

$$\sigma_\ell^{\beta\alpha} \cdot \Gamma(Y, \beta(M - \alpha A_\ell)) + \sigma_m^{\beta\alpha} \cdot \Gamma(Y, \beta(M - \alpha A_m)) \,,$$

chosen sufficiently generically such that H_1 does not contain any irreducible component of $H_0 \cap Y$. Then $H_1\big|_Y - \beta\alpha Z_{\ell m}$ is effective.

By construction, $Y \cap H_0 \cap H_1$ is a finite union of closed points, so we can let H_2 be a hyperplane that avoids those points to ensure that $Y \cap H_0 \cap H_1 \cap H_2 = \emptyset$. By construction,

$$\big(H_0\big|_Y - \beta\alpha Z_{ij}\big) + \big(H_1\big|_Y - \beta\alpha Z_{\ell m}\big) + H_2\big|_Y$$

is effective, and this is the divisor (55). This proves (a).

For part (b), let σ_i be as above, and let H_0 be the hyperplane associated to an element of $\sigma_i^{\beta\alpha} \cdot \Gamma(Y, \beta(M - \alpha A_i))$, chosen generically so that H_0 does not contain C. Let H_1 be a hyperplane in $\mathbb{P}^N_k$, chosen so that $C \cap H_0 \cap H_1 = \emptyset$. Since $H_0\big|_C - Z_{ij}\big|_C$ is an effective divisor, so is (56). □

Lemma 8.5. *Let i, j, ℓ be distinct indices. Then:*

(a). *there exist hyperplanes H_0, H_1, and H_2 in $\mathbb{P}^N_k$, such that*

$$Y \cap H_0 \cap H_1 \cap H_2 = \emptyset$$

and

$$(H_0 + H_1 + H_2)\big|_Y - \beta\alpha(Z_{ij} + Z_{i\ell} + Z_{j\ell})$$

is an effective Cartier divisor on Y; and

(b). *given any integral curve $C \subseteq Y$ not contained in any of the Z_{ab}, there are hyperplanes H_0 and H_1 in $\mathbb{P}^N_k$, such that $C \cap H_0 \cap H_1 = \emptyset$ and*

$$(H_0 + H_1)\big|_C - \beta\alpha(Z_{ij} + Z_{i\ell})\big|_C \tag{57}$$

is an effective Cartier divisor on C.

Proof. Let σ_i and σ_j be as in the preceding proof. Choose a section of the linear system

$$\sigma_i^{\beta\alpha} \cdot \Gamma(Y, \beta(M - \alpha A_i)) + \sigma_j^{\beta\alpha} \cdot \Gamma(Y, \beta(M - \alpha A_j)) \,,$$

and let H_0 be the associated hyperplane. Then $H_0\big|_Y - \beta\alpha Z_{ij}$ is effective. We may assume that the choice of H_0 is sufficiently generic so that H_0 does not contain any irreducible component of A_ℓ.

Next let σ_ℓ be the canonical section of $\mathscr{O}(A_\ell)$, and let H_1 be the hyperplane associated to a section of

$$\sigma_\ell^{\beta\alpha} \cdot \Gamma(Y, \beta(M - \alpha A_\ell)) \ .$$

Then $H_1\big|_Y - \beta\alpha(Z_{i\ell} + Z_{j\ell})$ is effective. We may assume that H_1 does not contain any irreducible component of $Y \cap H_0$.

Again, $Y \cap H_0 \cap H_1$ consists of finitely many points, and we choose H_2 to be any hyperplane not meeting any of these points. Part (a) then concludes as in the previous lemma.

For part (b), let H_0 and H_1 be the hyperplanes associated to suitably chosen sections of $\sigma_i^{\beta\alpha} \cdot \Gamma(Y, \beta(M - \alpha A_i))$ and $\Gamma(Y, \beta M)$, respectively. As in the previous lemma, we then have $C \cap H_0 \cap H_1 = \emptyset$. Since $H_0\big|_C - \beta\alpha(Z_{ij} + Z_{i\ell})\big|_C$ is effective, so is (57). □

Proof of Proposition 8.3. First consider part (a) of the proposition.

Fix a place $v \in M_k$. Apply Lemmas 8.4a and 8.5a to all possible collections i, j, ℓ, m and i, j, ℓ of indices, respectively. This involves only finitely many applications, so only finitely many hyperplanes occur. Let $H_1, \dots, H_q$ be those hyperplanes.

The conditions in Theorem 8.1 on the intersections of the divisors Z_{ij} imply that there is a constant C_v such that, for each $y \in Y(k)$ not in $\bigcup \operatorname{Supp} Z_{ij}$, one of the following conditions holds.

(i) $\lambda_{ij}(y) \le C_v$ for all i and j;
(ii) there are indices i and j such that $\lambda_{ij}(y) > C_v$ but $\lambda_{ab}(y) \le C_v$ in all other cases;
(iii) there are distinct indices i, j, ℓ, and m such that $\lambda_{ij}(y) > C_v$ and $\lambda_{\ell m}(y) > C_v$ but $\lambda_{ab}(y) \le C_v$ in all other cases; or
(iv) there are indices i, j, ℓ such that $\max\{\lambda_{ij}(y), \lambda_{i\ell}(y), \lambda_{j\ell}(y)\} > C_v$, but $\lambda_{ab}(y) \le C_v$ if $\{a, b\} \not\subseteq \{i, j, \ell\}$.

For case (iii), (53) follows from Lemma 8.4a, since one can take J corresponding to the hyperplanes occurring in the lemma, and the inequality will then follow from effectivity of (55). Case (ii) follows as a special case of this lemma, since $n \ge 4$. Case (iv) follows from Lemma 8.5a, by a similar argument. Finally, in case (i) there is nothing to prove. This proves (a).

For part (b), let $H_1, \dots, H_q$ be a finite collection of hyperplanes occurring in all possible applications of Lemmas 8.4b and 8.5b with the given curve C. We have cases (i)–(iv) as before. Cases (ii) and (iii) follow from Lemma 8.4b, where we may assume without loss of generality that $\lambda_{ij}(y) \ge \lambda_{\ell m}(y)$ to obtain (54) from effectivity of (56). Similarly, case (iv) follows from

Lemma 8.5b after a suitable permutation of the indices, and case (i) is again trivial. □

Remark 8.6. It will not actually be needed in the sequel, but the collections (c_v) of constants in each part of Proposition 8.3 are actually M_k-constants. This follows directly from Proposition 3.4.

Remark 8.7. It is possible (and, in fact, slightly easier) to write Proposition 8.3 in terms of b-Cartier b-divisors instead of Weil functions. For example, one can replace (53) with

$$\bigvee_{J\in\mathscr{J}} \sum_{j\in J} H_j \ge \beta\alpha \sum_{i<j} Z_{ij} \tag{58}$$

relative to the cone of effective b-Cartier b-divisors.

In the proof, one would let $\phi\colon Y \to X$ be a model for which the left-hand side of (58) pulls back to an ordinary divisor, and for each $P \in X$ one would consider four cases:

(i) $P \notin Z_{ij}$ for all i, j;
(ii) $P \in Z_{ij}$ for exactly one pair i, j;
(iii) there are distinct indices i, j, ℓ, m such that $P \in Z_{ij}$ and $P \in Z_{\ell m}$, but $P \notin Z_{ab}$ for all other components; and
(iv) there are indices i, j, ℓ such that P lies on at least two of Z_{ij}, $Z_{i\ell}$, and $Z_{j\ell}$, but $P \notin Z_{ab}$ if $\{a, b\} \not\subseteq \{i, j, \ell\}$.

In each case let U be the complement of all Z_{ab} that do not contain P. Then U is an open neighborhood of P in X, and there is a set J of indices such that $\sum_{j\in J} H_j - \beta\alpha \sum_{a<b} Z_{ab}$ is effective on U. This set J is obtained from Lemmas 8.4 or 8.5, as appropriate.

We choose to keep the phrasing in terms of Weil functions, however, since that is the phrasing that will be most convenient for the next step in the proof of Theorem 8.2.

9. Conclusion of the Proof of Theorem 8.2

Although it is possible to conclude from Proposition 8.3 that $\mathrm{Nev}_{\mathrm{bir}}\left(\sum Z_{ij}\right) < 1$, this does not follow nearly as directly as one might first hope. One needs to use Mumford's theory of degree of contact, as in the work of Evertse and Ferretti [EF02]. This leads to a definition of *Evertse–Ferretti Nevanlinna constant* $\mathrm{Nev}_{\mathrm{EF}}(\mathscr{L}, D)$ (Definition 9.3).

This section defines this new Nevanlinna constant, shows that it satisfies the expected diophantine property (Theorem 9.7), and uses this theory to complete the proof of Theorem 8.2.

We start with a definition that corresponds to that of μ-b-growth, and is suitable for applying the work of Evertse and Ferretti.

Definition 9.1. *Let X be a normal complete variety, let D be an effective Cartier divisor on X, let $\mathscr{L}$ be a line sheaf on X, and let $\mu > 0$ be a rational number. We say that D has μ-**EF-growth with respect to** $\mathscr{L}$ if there is a model $\phi\colon Y \to X$ of X such that for all $Q \in Y$ there are a base-point-free linear subspace $V \subseteq H^0(X, \mathscr{L})$ with $\dim V = \dim X + 1$ and a basis $\mathcal{B}$ of V such that*

$$\phi^*(\mathcal{B}) \geq \mu\phi^* D \tag{59}$$

*in a Zariski-open neighborhood U of Q, relative to the cone of effective $\mathbb{Q}$-divisors on U. Also, we say that D has μ-**EF-growth** if it satisfies the above condition with $\mathscr{L} = \mathscr{O}(D)$.*

As with Proposition 6.12, this definition can be expressed equivalently using b-Cartier b-divisors or b-Weil functions.

Proposition 9.2. *Let X be a normal complete variety, let D be an effective Cartier divisor on X, let $\mathscr{L}$ be a line sheaf on X, and let $\mu > 0$ be a rational number. Then the following are equivalent.*

(i) *D has μ-EF-growth with respect to $\mathscr{L}$.*

(ii) *Let n be a positive integer such that $n\mu \in \mathbb{Z}$. Then there are base-point-free linear subspaces $V_1, \dots, V_\ell$ of $H^0(X, \mathscr{L})$, all of dimension $\dim X + 1$, and corresponding bases $\mathcal{B}_1, \dots, \mathcal{B}_\ell$ of $V_1, \dots, V_\ell$, respectively, such that*

$$n \bigvee_{i=1}^{\ell} (\mathcal{B}_i) \geq n\mu D \tag{60}$$

relative to the cone of effective b-Cartier b-divisors.

(iii) *There are base-point-free linear subspaces $V_1, \dots, V_\ell$ of $H^0(X, \mathscr{L})$, all of dimension $\dim X + 1$; bases $\mathcal{B}_1, \dots, \mathcal{B}_\ell$ of $V_1, \dots, V_\ell$, respectively; Weil functions $\lambda_{\mathcal{B}_1}, \dots, \lambda_{\mathcal{B}_\ell}$ for the divisors $(\mathcal{B}_1), \dots, (\mathcal{B}_\ell)$, respectively; a Weil function λ_D for D; and an M_k-constant c such that*

$$\max_{1 \leq i \leq \ell} \lambda_{\mathcal{B}_i} \geq \mu\lambda_D - c \tag{61}$$

(as functions $X(M_k) \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$).

(iv) *For each $v \in M_k$ there are base-point-free linear subspaces $V_1, \dots, V_\ell$ of $H^0(X, \mathscr{L})$, all of dimension $\dim X + 1$; bases $\mathcal{B}_1, \dots, \mathcal{B}_\ell$ of $V_1, \dots, V_\ell$, respectively; local Weil functions $\lambda_{\mathcal{B}_1, v}, \dots, \lambda_{\mathcal{B}_\ell, v}$ at v for*

the divisors $(\mathcal{B}_1), \dots, (\mathcal{B}_\ell)$*, respectively; a local Weil function* $\lambda_{D,v}$ *for* D *at* v*; and a constant* c *such that*

$$\max_{1\le i\le \ell} \lambda_{\mathcal{B}_i,v} \ge \mu\lambda_{D,v} - c \tag{62}$$

(as functions $X(\overline{k}_v) \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$*).*

(v) *The condition of (iv) holds for at least one place* v*.*

Proof. Conditions (ii) and (iii) are equivalent by Proposition 6.10, and (iii)–(v) are equivalent by Proposition 3.4. The implication (ii) $\implies$ (i) follows from Lemma 6.13, with $D_i = (\mathcal{B}_i)$ for all i.

To finish the proof, it will suffice to show that (i) implies (ii).

Assume that condition (i) is true. Let $\phi\colon Y \to X$ be a model that satisfies the condition of Definition 9.1. By quasi-compactness of Y, we may assume that only finitely many triples $(U, V, \mathcal{B})$ occur. Let $(U_1, V_1, \mathcal{B}_1), \dots, (U_\ell, V_\ell, \mathcal{B}_\ell)$ be those triples. We may assume that $\bigvee(\mathcal{B}_i)$ is represented by a Cartier divisor E on Y, and that Y is normal. Let n be a positive integer such that $n\mu \in \mathbb{Z}$, and let n' be a positive integer such that $nn'\phi^*(\mathcal{B}_i) - nn'\mu\phi^*D$ is effective for all i. Then, for each i,

$$nn'E\big|_{U_i} \ge nn'\phi^*(\mathcal{B}_i)\big|_{U_i} \ge nn'\mu\phi^*D\big|_{U_i}$$

relative to the cone of effective Cartier divisors on U_i, and this implies (60) since Y is normal. □

Definition 9.3. *Let* X *be a complete variety, let* D *be an effective Cartier divisor on* X*, and let* $\mathscr{L}$ *be a line sheaf on* X*. If* X *is normal, then we define*

$$\operatorname{Nev}_{\mathrm{EF}}(\mathscr{L}, D) = \inf_{N,\mu} \frac{\dim X + 1}{\mu} ,$$

where the infimum passes over all pairs (N, μ) *such that* $N \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$*,* $\mu \in \mathbb{Q}_{>0}$*, and* ND *has* μ*-EF-growth with respect to* $\mathscr{L}^N$*. If there are no such pairs* (N, μ)*, then* $\operatorname{Nev}_{\mathrm{EF}}(\mathscr{L}, D)$ *is defined to be* $+\infty$*. For a general complete variety* X*,* $\operatorname{Nev}_{\mathrm{EF}}(\mathscr{L}, D)$ *is defined by pulling back to the normalization of* X*.*

If L *is a Cartier divisor or Cartier divisor class on* X*, then we define* $\operatorname{Nev}_{\mathrm{EF}}(L, D) = \operatorname{Nev}_{\mathrm{EF}}(\mathscr{O}(L), D)$*. We also define* $\operatorname{Nev}_{\mathrm{EF}}(D) = \operatorname{Nev}_{\mathrm{EF}}(D, D)$*.*

Remark 9.4. As in Remark 5.4, if n is a positive integer then

$$\operatorname{Nev}_{\mathrm{EF}}(\mathscr{L}, nD) = n \operatorname{Nev}_{\mathrm{EF}}(\mathscr{L}, D) .$$

The two parts of Proposition 8.3 say that $\beta \sum Z_{ij} = (\beta/2)M$ has α-EF-growth and $(\alpha/2)$-EF-growth, respectively, with respect to $\mathscr{O}(\beta M)$, and therefore

$$\mathrm{Nev}_{\mathrm{EF}}\left(\beta M, \frac{\beta}{2}M\right) \le \frac{3}{\alpha} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \mathrm{Nev}_{\mathrm{EF}}\left(\beta M, \frac{\beta}{2}M\right) \le \frac{4}{\alpha}\,,$$

respectively, on Y and C, respectively. By Remark 9.4, these become

$$\mathrm{Nev}_{\mathrm{EF}}(\beta M) \le \frac{6}{\alpha} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \mathrm{Nev}_{\mathrm{EF}}(\beta M) \le \frac{8}{\alpha}\,, \tag{63}$$

respectively.

The main result of this section, Theorem 9.7, is proved by first showing that $\mathrm{Nev}_{\mathrm{bir}}(\mathscr{L}, D) \le \mathrm{Nev}_{\mathrm{EF}}(\mathscr{L}, D)$ (Theorem 9.6). This, in turn, reduces to comparing the properties of μ-b-growth and μ-EF-growth.

Proposition 9.5. *Let X be a normal variety over a number field k, let D be an effective Cartier divisor on X, let $\mathscr{L}$ be a line sheaf on X, and let $\mu > 0$ be a rational number. Assume that D has μ-EF-growth with respect to $\mathscr{L}$. Then for all $\epsilon > 0$, there are a positive integer m, a rational number ν, and a linear subspace $V \subseteq H^0(X, \mathscr{L}^m)$ such that mD has ν-b-growth with respect to V and $\mathscr{L}^m$, and such that*

$$\frac{\dim V}{\nu} \le \frac{\dim X + 1}{\mu} + \epsilon\,. \tag{64}$$

Proof. Assume that D has μ-EF-growth with respect to $\mathscr{L}$. Let $V_1, \dots, V_\ell$; $\mathcal{B}_1, \dots, \mathcal{B}_\ell$; $\lambda_{\mathcal{B}_1}, \dots, \lambda_{\mathcal{B}_\ell}$; and λ_D be as in condition (iii) of Proposition 9.2.

Let $\{s_1, \dots, s_q\}$ be the elements of $\bigcup_i \mathcal{B}_i$. These sections determine a morphism $\Phi\colon X \to \mathbb{P}^{q-1}$. Let Y be the image. Note that Φ need not be a closed immersion; in fact, it may happen that $\dim Y < \dim X$. Let $n = \dim Y$.

From the theory of degree of contact (see [EF02, Sects. 3–4] or [Ru15b, Sect. 3] for the definitions), there is a constant $C > 0$ such that the inequality

$$c_{j_0} + \cdots + c_{j_n} \le \frac{n+1}{m} \frac{S_Y(m, \mathbf{c})}{H_Y(m)} \left(1 + \frac{C}{m}\right) \tag{65}$$

holds for all integers $m > 0$, all q-tuples $\mathbf{c} \in \mathbb{R}^q_{\ge 0}$, and all $(j_0, \dots, j_n)$ for which the divisors $(s_{j_0}), \dots, (s_{j_n})$ are base-point-free on X.

Fix a place v of k.

For each $j = 1, \dots, q$, choose a local Weil function $\lambda_{(s_j),v}$ for the divisor (s_j) at v. Since each (s_j) is effective, we may assume that each $\lambda_{(s_j)}$ is nonnegative.

We will apply (65) with $\mathbf{c} = (\lambda_{(s_1),v}(x), \dots, \lambda_{(s_q),v}(x))$ for some $x \in X(\overline{k}_v)$. By (62), there is an index i such that

$$\lambda_{\mathcal{B}_i,v}(x) \ge \mu\lambda_{D,v}(x) + O(1)\ , \tag{66}$$

where the implicit constant does not depend on x (or i). Write $\mathcal{B}_i = \{s_{j_0}, \dots, s_{j_n}\}$. Then

$$c_{j_0} + \cdots + c_{j_n} = \lambda_{(s_{j_0}),v}(x) + \cdots + \lambda_{(s_{j_n}),v}(x) = \lambda_{\mathcal{B}_i,v}(x) + O(1)\ , \tag{67}$$

where the implicit constant does not depend on x. Since there are only finitely many possible values for i, the constant may also be taken independent of i.

Combining (65), (67), and (66) gives

$$\begin{aligned} S_Y(m,\mathbf{c}) &\ge \frac{mH_Y(m)}{(n+1)(1+C/m)}\mu\lambda_{D,v}(x) + O(1) \\ &= \nu m\lambda_{D,v}(x) + O(1)\ , \end{aligned}$$

where again the implicit constant does not depend on x, and

$$\nu = \frac{\mu H_Y(m)}{(n+1)(1+C/m)}\ .$$

Let V be the pull-back of $H^0(Y, \mathscr{O}(m))$. Then $\dim V = H_Y(m)$. Since $\dim X \ge n$, we have

$$\frac{\dim V}{\nu} = \frac{(n+1)(1+C/m)}{\mu} \le \frac{\dim X + 1}{\mu}\left(1 + \frac{C}{m}\right)\ .$$

Thus (64) holds for sufficiently large m.

On the other hand, by the definition of $S_Y(m,\mathbf{c})$ and our choice of $\mathbf{c}$, there are bases $\mathcal{B}_1, \dots, \mathcal{B}_r$ of V and corresponding local Weil functions $\lambda_{\mathcal{B}_1,v}, \dots, \lambda_{\mathcal{B}_r,v}$ such that

$$S_Y(m,\mathbf{c}) = \max_{1\le i\le r} \lambda_{(\mathcal{B}_i),v}(\Phi(x))$$

for all $x \in X(\overline{k}_v)$. Thus, after pulling the bases back to V and the local Weil functions back to X, we see that $S_Y(m,\mathbf{c})$ equals the left-hand side of (44), and hence mD has ν-b-growth with respect to V and $\mathscr{L}^m$. □

This proposition then leads quickly to the main results of the section.

Theorem 9.6. *Let X be a variety over a number field k, let D be an effective Cartier divisor on X, and let $\mathscr{L}$ be a line sheaf on X. Then*

$$\mathrm{Nev}_{\mathrm{bir}}(\mathscr{L}, D) \le \mathrm{Nev}_{\mathrm{EF}}(\mathscr{L}, D)\ . \tag{68}$$

Proof. We may assume that X is normal, since the definitions of $\mathrm{Nev}_{\mathrm{bir}}$ and $\mathrm{Nev}_{\mathrm{EF}}$ both handle the general case by pulling back to the normalization. We may also assume that $\mathrm{Nev}_{\mathrm{EF}}(\mathscr{L}, D) < \infty$ (otherwise there is nothing to prove).

Let $\epsilon > 0$. By definition of $\mathrm{Nev}_{\mathrm{EF}}$, there is a pair (N, μ) with $N \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ and $\mu \in \mathbb{Q}_{>0}$, such that ND has μ-EF-growth with respect to $\mathscr{L}^N$ and such that

$$\frac{\dim X + 1}{\mu} < \mathrm{Nev}_{\mathrm{EF}}(\mathscr{L}, D) + \epsilon \, .$$

By Proposition 9.5, there are a positive integer m, a rational number ν, and a linear subspace $V \subseteq H^0(X, \mathscr{L}^{mN})$ such that mND has ν-b-growth with respect to V and $\mathscr{L}^{mN}$, and such that

$$\frac{\dim V}{\nu} \leq \frac{\dim X + 1}{\mu} + \epsilon \, .$$

We then have

$$\mathrm{Nev}_{\mathrm{bir}}(\mathscr{L}, D) \leq \frac{\dim V}{\nu} < \mathrm{Nev}_{\mathrm{EF}}(\mathscr{L}, D) + 2\epsilon \, ,$$

and the proof concludes by letting ϵ go to zero. □

Theorem 9.7. *Let k be a number field, and let S be a finite set of places of k containing all archimedean places. Let X be a projective variety over k, and let D be an effective Cartier divisor on X. Then, for every $\epsilon > 0$, there is a proper Zariski-closed subset Z of X such that the inequality*

$$m_S(x, D) \leq (\mathrm{Nev}_{\mathrm{EF}}(D) + \epsilon)\, h_D(x) \tag{69}$$

holds for all $x \in X(k)$ outside of Z.

Proof. This is immediate from (68) and Theorem 1.5. □

Corollary 9.8. *Let X be a projective variety, and let D be an ample Cartier divisor on X. If $\mathrm{Nev}_{\mathrm{EF}}(D) < 1$ then there is a proper Zariski-closed subset Z of X such that any set of D-integral points on X has only finitely many points outside of Z.*

Finally, we are able to prove Theorem 8.2.

Proof of Theorem 8.2. (a). By (63) and the assumption $\alpha > 6$, we have

$$\mathrm{Nev}_{\mathrm{EF}}(\beta M) \leq \frac{6}{\alpha} < 1 \, .$$

The result then follows by Corollary 9.8.

(b). Let Z be the Zariski closure of a set of D-integral points on Y. By part (a), $Z \neq Y$, so it will suffice to show that no irreducible component of

Z can be a curve. This holds because, on any curve C in Y not contained in $\operatorname{Supp} M$,

$$\operatorname{Nev}_{\mathrm{EF}}(\beta M) \le \frac{8}{\alpha} < 1 \ ,$$

and we conclude as before. □

References

[Aut09] Pascal Autissier. "Géométries, points entiers et courbes entières". In: *Ann. Sci. Éc. Norm. Supér. (4)* 42.2 (2009), pp. 221–239. ISSN: 0012-9593.

[Aut11] Pascal Autissier. "Sur la non-densité des points entiers". In: *Duke Math. J.* 158.1 (2011), pp. 13–27. ISSN: 0012-7094. DOI: 10.1215/00127094-1276292. URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.1215/00127094-1276292.

[Car33] Henri Cartan. "Sur les zéros des combinaisons linéaires de p fonctions holomorphes données". In: *Mathematica (Cluj)* 7 (1933), pp. 5–29.

[Cor07] Alessio Corti, ed. *Flips for 3-folds and 4-folds*. Vol. 35. Oxford Lecture Series in Mathematics and its Applications. Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2007, pp. x+189. ISBN: 978-0-19-857061-5. DOI: 10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198570615.001.0001. URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198570615.001.0001.

[EF02] Jan-Hendrik Evertse and Roberto G. Ferretti. "Diophantine inequalities on projective varieties". In: *Int. Math. Res. Not.* 25 (2002), pp. 1295–1330. ISSN: 1073-7928. DOI: 10.1155/S107379280210804X. URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.1155/S107379280210804X.

[EF08] Jan-Hendrik Evertse and Roberto G. Ferretti. "A generalization of the Subspace Theorem with polynomials of higher degree". In: *Diophantine approximation*. Vol. 16. Dev. Math. SpringerWienNewYork, Vienna, 2008, pp. 175–198. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-211-74280-8_9. arXiv:math.NT/0408381. URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-211-74280-8_9.

[Fal02] G. Faltings. "A new application of Diophantine approximations". In: *A panorama of number theory or the view from Baker's garden (Zürich, 1999)*. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 2002, pp. 231–246. DOI: 10.1017/CBO9780511542961.016. URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511542961.016.

[Har77] Robin Hartshorne. *Algebraic geometry*. Graduate Texts in Mathematics, No. 52. New York: Springer-Verlag, 1977, pp. xvi+496. ISBN: 0-387-90244-9.

[Lan83] Serge Lang. *Fundamentals of Diophantine geometry*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1983, pp. xviii+370. ISBN: 0-387-90837-4. DOI: 10.1007/978-1-4757-1810-2. URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4757-1810-2.

[Lev09] Aaron Levin. "Generalizations of Siegel's and Picard's theorems". In: *Ann. of Math. (2)* 170.2 (2009), pp. 609–655. ISSN: 0003-486X. DOI: 10.4007/annals.2009.170.609. URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.4007/annals.2009.170.609.

[Mat86] Hideyuki Matsumura. *Commutative ring theory*. Vol. 8. Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics. Translated from the Japanese by M. Reid. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1986, pp. xiv+320. ISBN: 0-521-25916-9.

[Ru09] Min Ru. "Holomorphic curves into algebraic varieties". In: *Ann. of Math. (2)* 169.1 (2009), pp. 255–267. ISSN: 0003-486X. DOI: 10.4007/annals.2009.169.255. URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.4007/annals.2009.169.255.

[Ru15a] M. Ru. "A defect relation for holomorphic curves intersecting general divisors in projective varieties". To appear, *J. Geom. Anal.* 2015.

[Ru15b] M. Ru. "A general Diophantine inequality". To appear, *Funct. Approx. Comment. Math.* 2015.

[Ser89] Jean-Pierre Serre. *Lectures on the Mordell-Weil theorem*. Aspects of Mathematics, E15. Translated from the French and edited by Martin Brown from notes by Michel Waldschmidt. Friedr. Vieweg & Sohn, Braunschweig, 1989, pp. x+218. ISBN: 3-528-08968-7. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-663-14060-3. URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-663-14060-3.

[Sil87] Joseph H. Silverman. "Arithmetic distance functions and height functions in Diophantine geometry". In: *Math. Ann.* 279.2 (1987), pp. 193–216. ISSN: 0025-5831. DOI: 10.1007/BF01461718. URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF01461718.

[Ste10] Stuart A. Steinberg. *Lattice-ordered rings and modules*. Springer, New York, 2010, pp. xviii+630. ISBN: 978-1-4419-1720-1. DOI: 10.1007/978-1-4419-1721-8. URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4419-1721-8.

[Voj11] Paul Vojta. "Diophantine approximation and Nevanlinna theory". In: *Arithmetic geometry*. Vol. 2009. Lecture Notes in Math. Springer, Berlin, 2011, pp. 111–224. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-642-15945-9_3. URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-15945-9_3.

[Voj87] Paul Vojta. *Diophantine approximations and value distribution theory*. Vol. 1239. Lecture Notes in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1987, pp. x+132.

ISBN: 3-540-17551-2. DOI: 10.1007/BFb0072989. URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BFb0072989.

[Voj89] Paul Vojta. "A refinement of Schmidt's subspace theorem". In: *Amer. J. Math.* 111.3 (1989), pp. 489–518. ISSN: 0002-9327. DOI: 10.2307/2374670. URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/2374670.

[Voj96] Paul Vojta. "Integral points on subvarieties of semiabelian varieties. I". In: *Invent. Math.* 126.1 (1996), pp. 133–181. ISSN: 0020-9910. DOI: 10.1007/s002220050092. URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s002220050092.

[Voj97] Paul Vojta. "On Cartan's theorem and Cartan's conjecture". In: *Amer. J. Math.* 119.1 (1997), pp. 1–17. ISSN: 0002-9327. URL: http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/american_journal_of_mathematics/v119/119.1vojta

[Yam04] Katsutoshi Yamanoi. "Algebro-geometric version of Nevanlinna's lemma on logarithmic derivative and applications". In: *Nagoya Math. J.* 173 (2004), pp. 23–63. ISSN: 0027-7630. URL: http://projecteuclid.org/euclid.nmj/1114631982.

[Zan05] Umberto Zannier. "On the integral points on the complement of ramification-divisors". In: *J. Inst. Math. Jussieu* 4.2 (2005), pp. 317–330. ISSN: 1474-7480. DOI: 10.1017/S1474748005000071. URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S1474748005000071.

[Zha95] Shouwu Zhang. "Positive line bundles on arithmetic varieties". In: *J. Amer. Math. Soc.* 8.1 (1995), pp. 187–221. ISSN: 0894-0347. DOI: 10.2307/2152886. URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/2152886.

[ZS60] Oscar Zariski and Pierre Samuel. *Commutative algebra. Vol. II*. The University Series in Higher Mathematics. D. Van Nostrand Co., Inc., Princeton, N. J.-Toronto-London-New York, 1960, pp. x+414.

Department of Mathematics, University of Houston, 4800 Calhoun Road, Houston, TX 77204, USA; Department of Mathematics, University of California, 970 Evans Hall #3840, Berkeley, CA 94720-3840, USA

E-mail address: minru@math.uh.edu, vojta@math.berkeley.edu